CHURCH QUARTERLY REVIEW.

No LIII. OCTOBER 1888.

ART. I.—THE LAMBETH CONFERENCE OF 1888.

 Conference of Bishops of the Anglican Communion, holden at Lambeth Palace, July 1888. Encyclical Letter from the Bishops, with Resolutions and Reports. (London, S.P.C.K., 1888.)

2. The Guardian, July 4 and August 8, 15, 22, 1888.

THE third 'Pan-Anglican' Conference, which was in course of proceeding when we last addressed our readers, is now an event in the year's ecclesiastical history. We take, therefore, the first opportunity of attempting an estimate of its results, in their bearing on those interests which, from our point of view, must be paramount—the spiritual interests of this great

Church of England.

The very conception of such a gathering of all the prelates of her communion, under the presidency of the successor of St. Augustine, is a token of her imperishable vitality as a Church of the old historic type. It must ultimately be traced to the unspent forces which were re-awakened in the Church-revival movement, and which have so repeatedly disappointed the opponents who made sure of their exhaustion. Much more must the actual carrying out of such a conception illustrate what the Dean of St. Paul's has described as 'the extrication of the great idea of the Church, in its religious and spiritual significance, from the earthly associations which had encumbered and obscured it,'1 and kindle and lift the hearts of serious Churchmen by reminding them that the kingdom of Christ, at present here under 'Anglican' forms, has a majesty independent of State-connexion, a capacity, long unimagined, for self-expansion throughout the vast domain of English speech, and an aptitude for representing, with real dignity and impressive emphasis, the whole range

Dean Church, Advent Sermons, p. 82.

VOL. XXVII.-NO. LIII.

in

fc

la

SE

of

sa

ar

us

of religious ideas which centre in the Christian hierarchy. It is, indeed, particularly opportune that, at a time when democracy claims to dominate in the spiritual sphere as well as in the temporal, there should appear at the chief historic centres of our Church life an ecclesiastical assemblage which, in its purely episcopal constitution, resembles the great ancient synods, and thus far witnesses for the principle, essential to Apostolic Churchmanship, that after full recognition of the spiritual rights of baptized communicants and of ordained ministers, it is on the chief pastors of the flock that our Lord has imposed a supreme solicitude and a unique and final responsibility. We cannot wonder that persons whose standpoint is that of religious individualism should look somewhat coldly on this great prelatic concourse; nor that an Erastian Broad Churchman, like the late Dean Stanley, should have regarded the first Lambeth Conference with an unfriendliness which represented a true instinct. Men of all schools would see, more or less distinctly, what the phenomenon meant. On the other hand, it cannot be denied that the bringing together of bishops of the Home Church, of Ireland, Scotland, India, the Colonies, and the United States, involved some anomalies which craved wary walking, and suggested some uncertainties which might excuse a certain amount of uneasi-The time available was very short—it might seem too short—for the mature consideration of all the momentous agenda. The members of the consultative body were not bound by absolutely identical standards, nor was the lex supplicandi in all cases the same. (We refer, e.g., to the non-recognition of the Athanasian Creed in the American formularies, and to the unhappy 'deformation' which ignorant partisanship has inflicted on the Irish Prayer-Book.) The body itself, as a whole, was external to the legal system of the Church of England, as such; its resolutions, whatever they might be, could not override those of provincial synods within the provinces of Canterbury and of York; it was not itself, properly speaking, a synod; it could not, therefore, in any strict sense 'commit' the Church; and yet she might be morally compromised, in the eyes of the world at large, by utterances proceeding from a source which on her own principles, must be regarded as so venerable. Or again, to speak more plainly, it could not but be felt that bishops, like other men, were liable to indiscretions; that some might have what, in homely phrase, would be called 'fads,' and might push them forward inconsideratelymight mistake ecclesiastical sentimentalism for that much

Oct.

It

no-

s in

tres

its

ient

to

the

ned

ord

inal

and-

vhat

tian

e re-

ness

ould

eant.

ging

cot-

ome

ome

easi-

too

tous

andi

ogni-

aries,

isan-

body

f the they

nods

was

here-

t she

world hich

rable.

e felt

ions;

d be

ely much rarer thing, ecclesiastical statesmanship-might neglect to ask themselves the proverbially pertinent question, 'Can't you let it alone?'- might forget that vague language on complicated subjects, however satisfying for the moment, is fruitful in embarrassments for the future—might be ambitious of inaugurating new departures, and over-ready to try heroic experiments-or might, from controversial motives, be bent on obtaining for the English Church the προστασία and ήγεμονία of a miscellaneous Continental anti-Romanism. It was not less reasonable than loyal to check such misgivings by the hope that, in spite of the risk of premature decisions during the last few days of the Conference, the collective 'practical wisdom' of the whole company would go far to correct any ill-advised action on the part of individuals, or sections swayed by individuals; an expectation which, on the whole, will appear to be justified by the formulated results of debates in full sessions, as they are now presented to the Church. We say, 'on the whole,' because, as will presently be seen, there are some passages in the document adopted by the Conference which we think open to exception, and as to which, perhaps, it may be surmised that another week of discussion would have brought them into a more acceptable shape; while for much the larger part of that document, and for the spirit and tone which pervade it, we can but express a thankfulness which neither requires nor admits of qualifi-

And now to give some answer to the question, What has the Conference done?

In the authorized pamphlet before us, the Encyclical letter begins with a solemn address, which, in the very ring of its language, indicates the 'Churchly' spirit in which the Conference regarded its own function:

'To the Faithful in Christ Jesus, greeting: We, Archbishops, Bishops Metropolitan, and other Bishops of the Holy Catholic Church, in full communion with the Church of England, one hundred and forty-five in number, all having superintendence over dioceses, or lawfully commissioned to exercise episcopal functions therein, assembled from divers parts of the earth, at Lambeth Palace, in the year of our Lord 1888, under the presidency of the Most Reverend Edward, by Divine Providence Archbishop of Canterbury, Primate of all England, and Metropolitan, after receiving in the chapel of the said palace the Blessed Sacrament of the Lord's Body and Blood, and uniting in prayer for the guidance of the Holy Spirit, have taken into consideration various questions which have been submitted to us, affecting the welfare of God's people and the condition of the Church in divers parts of the world.'

It will be seen that the number of prelates 'attending the Conference' came within five of the 'hundred and fifty' associated in Church history with the name of that Council of Constantinople which, by virtue of subsequent acceptance, is reckoned as the second Œcumenical Synod. The Archbishop of Canterbury opened the proceedings on the last day of June, by bidding a solemn welcome, from 'the patriarchal marble chair' in his metropolitical church, to his assembled brethren, 'most dear and to him most reverend.' We quote but a few words from this characteristic 'allocution,' as it is somewhat significantly named:

'Welcome to the chair which, when filled least worthily, most takes up its own parable, and speaks of unbroken lines of government and law and faith, and forgets not the yet earlier Christianity of the land whose lines soon flowed into and blended with the Roman and the Gallic and the Saxon strains. Round this chair have clustered the glorious memorials you see through ages—none more dear than his who spoke from it last, with a pathos and a courage quite his own. . . We know how dear to you is this sanctuary of our fathers and yours—yes, of your Father and our Father. And even because of the potency of its deep appeal to us to be holy in worship, pure in doctrine, strong in life—even for this appeal's sake we bid you remember the pregnant words of Gregory to Augustine himself, "Non pro locis res, sed pro bonis rebus loca amanda sunt."

The rest of His Grace's brief address consisted of a comment on those often-quoted words. He preached to the same auditors on the following Monday, at a solemn evensong in the great Abbey-church which he described as 'differing, even in plan and structure, from every sanctuary in the land,' and thus 'the symbol of all those forces which work not subordinated but in alliance; 'that 'wondrous fabric,' the 'witness' of which 'to things spiritual no man ever failed to see, hear, read.' This discourse was the utterance of a fervid and poetical mind, with a stronger tendency to the contemplation of ideals than would, perhaps, have been appreciated by his predecessor. The leading thought was the livingness of the Church, and her power of welding together the past and the present; a plea was made for 'strong centres' of Church activity, for manifoldness of auxiliary organization, for definitiveness of spiritual aim. We must needs quote two or three passages:

'We know well that spiritual life may be real without apostolic form; only we seem to see that, even in its most beautiful and manifold manifestations, it cannot without that form propagate itself indefinitely. . . . On the other hand, we know well that there may

ha the ser tha

WC

Re

wh

Le

18

be

th

fo

fai

po

an

on

CH

tia

ness vice by Arr biss Corepi of he

be whi

alta

Live ness this this sum by the Live be apostolic form without spiritual life, and that, like any other form that lacks life, its end is to break up and supply pabulum for lower forms of life. Our own humble, hopeful confidence lies in the possession of apostolic form with fervent spiritual charity and living faith.' 'The philanthropy of the gospel without its philotheism, any more than the form of a Church will live without its philotheism, any more than the form of a Church will live without the spirit.' 'A poor, unprovided, dependent clergy is scarcely able to be an unworldly one, and certainly cannot betoken an unworldly laity.' 'To say "Christianity is not a theology," is in one sense true, because Christianity is a life. But it would be quite as true to say, Christianity is not a history, or, Christianity is not a worship. But you cannot have the life without the worship, without the history, or without the theology.'

We do not think that our readers will complain of our having detained them, by these extracts, from the contents of the official pamphlet, in which we could wish that the Primate's We proceed to remind them sermon had been included. that the first session of the Conference occupied the first week of July; that its second and third weeks were devoted to the work of no less than twelve committees; and that their Reports were presented in the fourth week, at the final session, when the drafting and consideration of the Encyclical Letter' and the formal 'resolutions' brought the actual business to a close. On Saturday, July 28, the concluding service, in St. Paul's, consisting of a choral Eucharist, celebrated by the Archbishop of Canterbury, with a sermon by the Archbishop of York, was attended by all, or nearly all, the bishops, together with members of the Lower Houses of both Convocations, and of the Canterbury House of Laymen. The episcopal procession advancing into the choir, with the cross of Canterbury glittering on high in front of the Primate, as he walked between the Archbishop of York and the Bishop of London to take his place, in 'eastward position,' at the altar, was a sight to live long in glad remembrance.

The Encyclical and the accompanying Resolutions will be best understood in the light of the Reports of committees which were in the first instance considered, and which, as the

asid.' cukes

ct.

he

y'

cil

ce,

:h-

ast

ri-

and the the his wn. and e of in you Non

omame
g in
even
and
boress'
near,
and
ation
y his
the
the
urch
efini-

stolic and itself may

hree

¹ How deliberate this consideration was, we know from Archbishop Benson's letter in reply to the querulous criticisms of the Bishop of Liverpool, who had thought fit to occupy himself with 'diocesan business' during the specially important final session. It is significant that this episcopal representative of Puritanism had to admit that he was in this case one of 'a very small minority.' His own qualifications for 'assuming the airs of an Elijah towards his episcopal brethren' were examined by the Spectator in two articles, the first of which began, 'The Bishop of Liverpool hates Popery; but what a Pope he would make!'

former reminds us, 'can only be taken to represent the mind of the Conference so far as they are reaffirmed, or directly adopted, in the Resolutions.' We could almost wish that the unauthoritative character of the Reports had been emphasized by presenting them in smaller type.

It would, indeed, be best to read first the Reports on the several subjects, then the Resolutions corresponding to them, and then to take up the Encyclical, which was drawn up

after the Resolutions, and refers to them.

First of all, then, comes the Report of the committee on Intemperance, which is followed by those relating to Purity, Divorce, and Polygamy; then follow Reports on 'Sunday Observance, Socialism, the care of Emigrants, mutual relations of the Dioceses and Branches of the Anglican communion, Home reunion, the relation of the Anglican communion to Scandinavian and other reformed Churches, to the Old Catholics and other reforming bodies, its relation to the Eastern Churches,' and 'Authoritative Standards of doctrine and worship.' It may seem rather strange (especially when infidelity is so aggressive) that the subject of religious belief, and of its due doctrinal expression, was not put first in order; and while we recognize the desire of the Conference to emphasize its regard for moral interests, we cannot but regret that occasion was thus unintentionally given to a secular newspaper to patronize the bishops for having thus far kept 'dogmas' in due subordination. The Encyclical, to some extent, restores the more appropriate sequence of subjects by inserting, after the paragraph about emigrants, a weighty section on 'definite teaching of the faith,' which concludes by recommending to the clergy 'cautious and industrious treatment' of questions raised by popular scepticism, and by urging them to make the Person of Christ 'the central thought of their teaching. . . . The work of the Church is the application and extension of the blessings of the Incarnation,1 and her teaching the development of its doctrinal issues as contained in the creeds of the Church' (p. 13). How much of true theology is concentrated in this one sentence! We could wish that it were well pondered and laid to heart by all the younger clergy.

The Report on Intemperance treats 'total abstinence' as 'the main weapon to be used in the warfare against this widely prevailing sin,' but distinctly negatives the assumption that such abstinence is a universal Christian duty, and cen-

sta the

of

dili

18

su

ta

in and Ch No mainvering of the litter

sub

Con Div 'ca gui Chu sho innu Thi sucl mit inst wou on mat

aded Bish the b

diss

carr

a ne

¹ This phrase, in effect, explains and guards the more condensed phrase, 'extension of the Incarnation,' the true sense of which is drawn out in R. Wilberforce's *Doctrine of the Incarnation*, c. xiii.

Oct.

ind

ctly

the

zed

the

em,

up

on

ity,

Ob-

s of

ome

ndi-

and

nes,

S SO

due

hile

its

sion

r to

ores

after

inite

g to

ions

e the

f the

elop-

the

ated

pon-

e'as

this

otion

cen-

ensed

lrawn

It

sures' the fanaticism which sometimes makes the total abstainer talk of his abstinence as the one thing needful,' &c. (pp. 34-37). But the Resolution simply 'commends the Report to the consideration of the Church, without pledging itself to all the statements and opinions embodied' therein, and supplies in the following momentous words a warning which the Report had omitted:

'The Bishops assembled in this Conference declare that the use of unfermented juice of the grape, or any liquid other than true wine diluted or undiluted, as the element in the administration of the cup in Holy Communion, is unwarranted by the example of Our Lord, and is an unauthorized departure from the custom of the Catholic Church' (p. 21).

Nothing could be more satisfactory; not only is the true matter of the Sacrament guarded against a substitution which involves unintentional sacrilege, but the Conference, as some critics would think, goes out of its way to express a recognition of the primitive usage of 'the Mixture.' For this, we observe, it has been honoured by a scolding from Lord Grimthorpe.

The Conference unanimously adopted the Report on the subject of Purity (naturally emanating from a committee of which the Bishop of Durham had been chairman), as expressing

its own mind.

The committee on Divorce obtained the approval of the Conference for three conclusions, to the following effect: Divorce (evidently meaning, not à mensa et thoro, but à vinculo) 'cannot be recognized except for fornication or adultery; the guilty party, in such a case, ought not to be remarried in the Church during the lifetime of the innocent party; but clergy should not be instructed to refuse Church privileges to the innocent party who has remarried under civil sanction '(p. 21) This leaves some ambiguity; did the Conference mean that such a party should not be remarried in church? The committee had recommended that the diocesan should be left to instruct the clergy on that point, 'where the laws of the land would permit; ' but this might involve diversities of judgment on the matter. It will, we suppose, be admitted that as a matter of strict right, the assertion of a husband's right to dissolve the vinculum on account of a wife's unfaithfulness carries with it logically the assertion of the right to contract a new marriage. This, however, is too big a question to be adequately discussed here and now.

¹ At the present time it may be opportune to quote a few words from Bishop Wilson's Sacra Privata—Sunday Meditations: 'Upon placing the bread and wine and water upon the altar' (ed. Denton, 1853, p. 105).

The committee on Polygamy arrived at a conclusion which should be accepted most thankfully, and perhaps with a sense of relief, by those who believe that the Church has no authority to dispense with the obligations of the law of Christ for those who deliberately adopt His service in baptism (p. 45). This conclusion involved a disregard of much kindly sentimentalism, and of arguments which might be applicable to other heathen customs or institutions beside polygamy. And so the Conference, by 83 votes to 21, advised that 'persons living in polygamy be not admitted to baptism, but that they be accepted as candidates, and kept under Christian instruction until such time as they shall be in a position to accept the law of Christ' (p. 22). The second part of this Resolution is in favour of 'admitting the wives of polygamists to baptism in some cases,' but leaves it to the local Church authorities 'to decide under what circumstances they may be baptized.' reason for this distinction appears to be stated in 'the Report,' that 'in most countries where polygamy prevails such wives have no personal freedom to contract or dissolve a matrimonial alliance,' and that 'presumably they do not violate the Christian precept which enjoins fidelity to one husband' (p. 46). But do they not live as polygamous wives, and so as acquiescing in a relation which, on the principle of the Resolution, is, as such, incompatible with Christianity?

The chief remarks which suggest themselves as to the Report and Resolution on Sunday Observance is that, whereas the former describes 'the principle of the religious observance of one day in seven' as 'of Divine and primeval obligation,' the words which we italicize are omitted in the latter (pp. 48, 22), so as not to commit the Conference to an affirmation of its pre-Mosaic observance; and that whereas the former asserts that 'the first day of the week was ere long adopted by the Church as the Christian Sabbath or the Lord's Day,' this inaccurate statement is corrected by the latter, which reads, 'it gradually succeeded, as the great weekly festival of the Christian Church, to the sacred position of the Sabbath.'

The Report on Socialism ought to convince outsiders that the Church's attention is seriously directed towards a great social and economical problem, which may become yet more urgent in the near future. It is not explicitly adopted in the Resolution, but 'submitted to the consideration of the Churches of the Anglican communion' (p. 23), as containing 'suggestions which may assist in solving this problem without violence or injustice' (p. 11). These suggestions are forcibly propounded; communism is deprecated, co-operation and thrift

are in i pro effe pro 'ecc Sociand the know the

cha

188

is a whie the Mut adve Am thus bish appi Eng nest prov of th at ho feren ' pati latte some and stood comr a con of Ca 'emin a 'de Cath glicar

operati Septen

Chure

Chris

t.

h

se

y

se

is

n,

n

n-

in .c-

on

W

in in

to

he

rt.

res

ial

is-

.6).

ng

as

the

eas

nce

on,

48,

of

mer

ted

ay,

nich I of

that reat

nore

the

ches

gesence

pro-

hrift

are recommended; competition is declared to be 'not injurious in itself, but only to become so when unrestricted;' but 'the protection of the class known as proletarians from the evil effects of unchecked competition' is regarded as within the province of government, and the clergy are advised to study 'economic science,' to 'enter into friendly relations with Socialists' in order 'to understand their aims and methods,' and to show in their teaching 'how property is a trust,' and how 'the call to aid the weak, through works of what is ordinarily known as charity, has been at all times faithfully pressed by the Church of Christ,' while 'the matter is one not merely of charity, but of social and Christian duty,' &c. (pp. 53–7).

The Report on the religious and moral care of Emigrants is a very interesting and thoroughly practical paper (p. 58), which is dealt with by the Conference in the same manner as the preceding Report. The like may be said of the Report on Mutual Relations of Anglican Dioceses or Churches, which, adverting to the Cummins schism, accepts the view of the American episcopate as to the nullity of orders alleged to be thus derived; recommends the adoption of the title of 'archbishop' by metropolitans of certain 'important provinces;' approves of the proposal to form a 'council of reference' in England, to advise colonial 'tribunals of appeal;' and earnestly deprecates revision of the Prayer-Book by this or that province or diocese 'without consultation with other portions of the Anglican communion, and especially with the Church at home' (pp 71-75). Of the last two proposals the Conference declined to adopt the former, preferring to rely on 'patient consideration and consultation' (p. 15); while on the latter point the Resolutions virtually endorse, though with some modification of language, the opinion of the committee, and we gladly infer that two of the Irish prelates understood alike its value and its application (p. 24). But the committee, in an Appendix to their Report, suggested that a committee of English bishops, appointed by the Archbishop of Canterbury, with power to consult other bishops and also 'eminent divines outside the episcopal body,' should draw up a 'declaration' of Anglican doctrine on such subjects as the Catholic Faith, the Holy Scriptures, the Sacraments, the Anglican forms of prayer and liturgy, the relation of the Anglican Churches to the Roman and Eastern Churches, and to other Christian Churches and societies, and the relation of the teach-

¹ It is not imagined, we presume, that Socialists would accept 'cooperation' in lieu of their own ideal. See the *Contemporary Review* for September.

fi

SI

(2

B

th

th

th

he

the

tio

"m

Qu

hi.

ing of the Church of Christ to human knowledge;' such declaration to be of a character which all 'English-speaking bishops' (a phrase employed in curious obliviousness of Cardinal Manning and his brethren) 'could adopt' (p. 78).1 Hereupon the Conference, with the caution natural to a larger body, 'requested the Archbishop to give his attention to this Appendix, with a view to action if, upon consideration, His Grace should think such action desirable' (p. 24). We hope that His Grace will pause before taking such action, for which, we fear, the condition of Church opinion is hardly ripe. It will be observed that the committee recognized 'difficulties,' and only thought that they might 'possibly be overcome;' and it is too obvious that to state 'the definite doctrinal grounds upon which the Anglican Churches stand,' without entering upon any 'questions of doubtful controversy,' would be impossible, unless the questions referred to are such as do not involve the differences of principle which in fact exist among Anglican Christians.

The next subject is Home Reunion. The committee, of which the Bishop of Sydney was the chairman, recite in their Report certain expressions of a desire for this object on the part of Convocation and of the Colonial and American Churches. We cannot but appreciate the grave moderation which they exhibit in regard to one aspect of the case:

'The Committee, with deep regret, felt that, under present conditions, it was useless to consider the question of reunion with our brethren of the Roman Church, being painfully aware that any proposal for reunion would be entertained by the authorities of that Church only on condition of a complete submission on our part to those claims of absolute authority, and the acceptance of those other errors, both in doctrine and in discipline, against which in faithfulness to God's holy Word, and to the true principles of His Church, we have been for three centuries bound to protest' (p. 85).

The time has been when Anglican prelates would have spoken of the Latin Church in far less measured language—

VI INA

¹ It is right to add that another committee, presided over by the Bishop of Ely, professed itself 'unable, after careful consideration of the subject, to recommend that any new declaration of doctrine should at the present time be put forth by authority;' but suggested a different undertaking, the compilation by three or more bishops of a manual for teachers, which should draw 'its statements of doctrine from authoritative documents already existing, but would exhibit them in a completer and more systematic form. It would also naturally include some explanation of the services and ceremonies of the Church. The whole might be preceded by an historical sketch of the position and claims of our communion' (p. 111). The Conference, we are glad to say, did not act on this suggestion.

ct.

ch

ng

ar-

3).1

rer

his

lis

pe

for

lly

ffi-

er-

iite

nd,

sy,

ıch

act

, of

neir

the

can

tion

con-

any

that t to

ther

nful-

irch,

nave

ge-

ishop

in language of mere repulsion and denunciation. But when the committee proceed to express an opinion 'that with the chief of the Nonconforming communions there would not only be less difficulty than is commonly supposed as to the basis of a common faith in the essentials of Christian doctrine, but that even in respect of Church government many of the causes which had originally led to secession had been removed, and that both from deeper study, and from larger historical experience, there was in the present day a greater disposition to value and to accept the ancient Church order ' (p. 86), we must needs ask whether they had taken account of a steadily increasing deviation, on the part even of Wesleyan Methodists, from the Church doctrine of the Sacraments, and from all that such doctrine involves; 2 and whether they seriously imagined (and, if so, on what evidence?) that any one of the 'communions' in question had abated its hostility to a Church system which they are accustomed to condemn on the express ground of its sacerdotalism? The committee proceed to adopt the basis suggested in 1886 by the American House of Bishops: it consists of the Scriptures, the Apostles' and Nicene Creeds (of course, no American bishops could, in their own 'House,' say a word about the Athanasian), 'the two Sacraments ordained by Christ Himself, Baptism and the Supper of the Lord . . . and the historic Episcopate,3 locally adapted in the method of its administration to the varying needs of the nations'-whatever that may imply. It is but right to say that this report, signed by 'Alfred Sydney,' contains not one

² For evidence, only too sadly ample, on this point, see Church

Quarterly Review, vol. xix. pp. 294-94, 322-31.

bject, esent king, which ments matic rvices n his-The

The Bishop of Salisbury is reported (Guardian, August 15) to have said, when preaching in his cathedral, 'We cannot expect Roman Catholics in this country to receive us as a body; but we can, I think, by showing our own Catholic position, by affirming our own right to the full heritage of the Church, by openness and frankness, and perfect truthfulness and confidence, and by expecting such openness and frankness from them in return—from individuals, I mean, not from the whole body—we can make a great impression upon individuals; and I very much wish that the Lambeth Conference had said something hopeful in that direction.' Such noble words from a prelate of the English Church ought to 'make a great impression.'

³ We presume that this phrase was meant to exclude the sham episcopate of the American Methodists, and any so-called episcopate not derived by succession from antiquity, and not carrying with it the 'historic ministry' of Holy Orders. But it would surely have been better to speak more explicitly as to Sacramental administration. However, the 'historic episcopate' is here clearly treated as not a mere ornament, but a necessary condition, of true Church life. Compare Dr. Liddon's sermon, A Father in Christ, 2nd ed.

word about a proposal to recognize the validity, notwithstanding the 'irregularity' (a phrase not used in its technical sense), of non-episcopal ministries—according to a report which somehow found its way into the newspapers, and which excited some premature jubilation in certain quarters. ference, in its Resolution, adopts the triple basis here described, and, after the American precedent, goes so far as to request the various Anglican Church authorities to announce their 'readiness to enter into brotherly conference with the representatives of other Christian communions in the English-speaking races, in order to consider what steps can be taken, either towards corporate reunion, or towards such relations as may prepare the way for fuller organic unity hereafter.' Here the Encyclical supplies something more distinct in the direction of needful safeguards: 'However we may long to embrace those now alienated from us . . . we must not be unfaithful stewards of the great deposit entrusted to us; we cannot desert our position either as to faith or discipline' (p. 15). Good; then we ask, Is it really supposed that the Scottish Presbyterian communions, or the English Nonconformist sects, are likely to come over to 'our position'? Have they, as bodies, indicated the slightest disposition to meet us even half-way? Is it not, on the contrary, quite evident that they have no such desire, and that their avowed principles put it clean out of the question? Did not an eminent Nonconformist not long ago assert

of 'C' the me wi me 'sa ten

18

th

reg

but

cor

Re

of and browning quare

W. and lang gone term 'No treat men tion anyt nece Rom forge

Augu subje

¹ The resolution said to have been proposed by the Bishop of Sydney was, 'That in the opinion of this committee such conferences with Dissenters are likely to be fruitful, under God's blessing, of practical result only if undertaken with a willingness on behalf of the Anglican communion, while holding firmly the threefold order of the ministry as the normal rule of the Church, to be observed in the future, to recognize, in spite of what we must conceive as an irregularity, the ministerial character of those ordained in non-episcopal communions, through whom, as ministers, it has pleased God visibly to work for the salvation of souls and the advancement of His kingdom, and to provide, in such way as may be agreed upon, for the acceptance of such ministers as fellow-workers with us in the service of the Lord Jesus Christ.' This proposal, if it was really made, sustained signal defeat, for it appears nowhere in the Report issued by the chairman. It would not, perhaps, be edifying to inquire how it got abroad. Naturally, when made public, it was commented upon in the Guardian of August 22. Its scope is more extensive than that of the suggestion made in a published letter by the Bishop of St. Andrews in regard to his favourite hobby of a junction with the Established Scottish Kirk on the basis of leaving the acceptance of holy orders optional on the part of the existing generation of Presbyterian ministers, in case that establishment were to join hands with Prelacy, a suggestion, the ecclesiastical disloyalty of which is almost obscured by its peculiar absurdity, in view of the Act of Union and of the whole history of that Kirk.

1

S

ŝ,

S

e

1-

of

e

of

i-

re.

n-

to

ed

ot,

re,

S-

ert

is-

nly

on,

nal e of

of

ers,

be

vith ally

ued

w it

in in

t of

ews cotonal

case

uliar

that

that the time was come for 'developing' differences instead of smoothing them over? The Encyclical itself, speaking of 'Christian bodies not of our communion,' takes cognizance of 'the strong ties, the rooted convictions, which attach them to their present position' (p. 16). Can sensible and experienced men, whether bishops, clerics, or laics, expect that such roots will yield to a few suave words? Must we not take it as morally certain that 'eirenic' overtures on the part of a 'sacerdotal Church' would be rejected with thinly-veiled contempt, if not resented as implying a position of superiority?2 We are as anxious as any prelates can be for a true 'Home Reunion,' but we deem it worse than vain to ignore facts; we regard the idea of a 'corporate reunion' on the part of Nonconformist bodies as, humanly speaking, chimerical; and, while we hope, with good reason, for the gathering-in of many individuals from such communities, we confess frankly that we do not wish for conformists, as distinct from converts to Church belief, in the proper sense of the term.

The Report on 'Scandinavians, Old Catholics, and others,' is signed by 'E. Harold Winton' as chairman. We cannot but regret that his lordship, in the earlier part of the year, committed himself somewhat unadvisedly to a practical recognition of the Lutheran' Swedish Church.' The committee, under his leadership, reports to the effect that 'its standards of doctrine are, to a great extent, in accord with our own, and its continuity as a national Church has never been broken' (p. 90). We must plainly say that this is a very inadequate treatment of the real question involved. The qualification, 'to a great extent,' appears to be intended to except certain parts of the Augsburg Confession. But

³ See the *Nonconformist* of August 2, quoted in the *Guardian* of August 8, p. 1181. We cannot but agree with the *Guardian*, that on this subject 'the language of the Conference seems unpractically vague.'

Dr. Joseph Parker; see the Guardian of May 26, 1886. Also Mr. W. Arthur's language, quoted in the Contemporary Review of July 1887; and a quotation in the Spectator of April 14, 1888, of Mr. Morley Punshon's language at the Wesleyan Conference of 1874, e.g. 'The time has long gone by when we will listen to any proposal for union, except on equal terms.' The Guardian is fully warranted in affirming (August 15) that 'Nonconformists will hear of no treaty, of no concessions, unless they can treat on terms of absolute equality;' that the 'rights' which loyal Churchmen 'feel that they have in their Church's ancient and unbroken constituation' are not to be sacrificed in the hope of satisfying outsiders; and that anything implying 'an undervaluing, on our part, of the obligation and necessity of English orders, would put a new lever into the hands of Roman proselytizers.' Framers of comprehension-schemes are apt to forget that such 'rights' exist, and that it would be practically dangerous to ignore them.

(apart from the question of its succession 1) it is a fact that the Swedish communion has no such rite as the Apostolic ordinance of Confirmation. It is a fact that it has no such order as that of deacons. It is a fact that, within this century, it has substituted the word 'preacher' for the word 'priest,' or 'presbyter,' in its ordination service. It is a fact that its form for 'installing a bishop in office'—the only form by which its episcopate is transmitted—has a highly suspicious likeness to the form, not for 'ordaining' a preacher, but for 'installing' him, when ordained, in an incumbency.2 Are these facts to be lightly ignored? Were they unknown to all the fifteen members of the committee? Or were they supposed to have no bearing on the duty of the English Church in regard to Scandinavian Lutheranism? The committee confessed that 'greater difficulties were presented as regards communion with the Norwegian and Danish Churches by the constitution of their ministry,' this somewhat vapid euphemism being substituted for a plain statement of the fact that these 'Churches' do not even profess to retain episcopacy. The Conference, omitting the words quoted from the Report, adopted the proposal of the committee that 'approaches on the part of the Swedish Church with a view to the mutual explanation of differences should be most gladly welcomed, in order to the ultimate establishment, if possible, of intercommunion 3 on sound principles of ecclesiastical polity' (pp. 26, 91).

The last words, we suppose, were intended as a salvo: and we give them whatever weight they can thus claim, remarking at the same time that we do not regard the possession of an Apostolic ministry as a mere matter of 'polity' or 'Church order.' But we are bound to say that the whole Resolution is unsatisfactorily worded, in view of such grave 'differences' as exist between Swedes and English Churchmen; that it is not a mere question of 'mutual explanations,' as between two co-ordinate Churches; and that, as before, we are glad to fall back on the language of the Encyclical, as interpreting the

1 It seems probable that the episcopal succession was preserved amid

the changes of the sixteenth century.

omits this adjective, probably as superfluous.

and ma ofp we stol min spol set rites clea grov

(p. c

188

res

no e do v the ' ties Holy to ap not s Conf with may relati follor in It that by s congr

1 7 'As re in agr castle bishop definit of cour serious that th which the Ch . . it Orator Mass i Brevia

retaine are sho

on the

² We say this after careful and repeated examination of the Swedish forms for 'installing a bishop in office,' for 'ordaining to the preacher-office,' and for 'installing a church-pastor.' The word for 'ordaining' is once used in the first of these forms; but so the word for 'ordination' is once used in the third, where it cannot possibly mean anything but induction. In both, the term ordinarily used is to 'install.' And in the 'ordination of preachers' there is nothing now to indicate an intention of conferring what the Church knows as 'the holy order of priesthood.'

The Report says, 'of permanent intercommunion.' The Resolution

t

C

0

n e

a

y

y

r,

7.2

'n

ev

sh

n-

as

es id

ct cy.

rt,

on

ıal in

m-

1).

nd

ing

an

rch 1 is

as

not

two fall

the

mid

dish

her-

g' is n'is

but

n the

ntion

d. ution resolution to mean that 'fuller knowledge should be sought, and friendly intercourse interchanged, until such time as matters may be ripe for a closer alliance, without any sacrifice of principles which we hold to be essential' (p. 16); among which we assume with entire confidence that the principles of Apostolic Confirmation and Ordination hold a place in the bishops' minds, as in our own. The Archbishop of Canterbury has spoken his own mind at Westminster: 'The forces which are set forth in Christ's two Sacraments, and in the Apostolic rites of Confirmation and Ordination, are the forces that cleanse and bind together, that strengthen and organize for

growth.'

The paragraph in the Report on the 'Church of Holland' (p. 92) is abbreviated 1 in the Resolution (p. 26), and calls for no especial comment—certainly provokes no objection. Nor do we take exception to the moderately worded proposal that the 'clergy and faithful laity' of the Old Catholic communities in Germany and Switzerland should be admitted to Holy Communion, with the significant proviso that this is not to apply to 'any person who may have contracted a marriage not sanctioned' by Anglican 'laws and canons' (p. 94). The Conference sanctions this offer of 'privileges,' and also agrees with the committee in hoping that the Austrian Old Catholics may some 'day be sufficiently organized for a 'more formal relation' on our part than is now practicable (p. 26). Then follows, in both documents, a reference to the 'Reformers in Italy, France, Spain, and Portugal.' It is notorious that hopes were entertained as to a practical intervention, by sanction of the Conference, on behalf of the Italian congregations under Count Campello, and the Spanish and

¹ The resolution, perhaps for mere brevity's sake, omits the clause-'As regards ourselves, the Church of Holland is found on inquiry to be in agreement with our Church in many points.' The Bishops of Newcastle and Salisbury, on June 14 in this year, ascertained from the Archbishop of Utrecht that the Church of Holland 'accepts the dogmatic definitions of the Council of Trent, though not its canons of discipline. This of course,' says the Bishop of Salisbury in his account of their visit, 'is a serious difference between us and them. We were glad to find, however, that their priests are not required to sign the creed of Pope Pius IV., which is a great stumbling-block in the way of intercommunion between the Churches. When lectures are given on this creed in the Seminary . . it is always accompanied with the explanation of the Portuguese Oratorian Pereira, which minimizes its teaching as much as possible.' Mass is said according to the Roman rite, but the beautiful Parisian Breviary is substituted for the Roman. Communion in one kind is still retained, and so is the law of clerical celibacy. 'No acts of reverence are shown towards images or pictures.' The private study of the Bible on the part of laymen is thoroughly 'encouraged.'

Portuguese congregations under Señor Cabrera and others, whose tone appears to be vehemently Protestant.\(^1\) The Irish bishops had postponed any definite response to applications made by the latter until after the late Conference. What says the committee?

'We sympathize with their efforts to free themselves from the burden of unlawful terms of communion. . . . We trust that in time they may be enabled to adopt such sound forms of doctrine and discipline, and to secure such Catholic organization, as will permit us to give them a fuller recognition' (p. 95).²

And the Conference literally adopts their words, which are far enough from giving such sanction as Archbishop Lord Plunket was believed to desire. But this is not all. Assertions have lately been hazarded to the effect that ancient Church principles would permit Anglican bishops, by virtue of a supposed universal jurisdiction inherent in every bishop as such, to interfere at discretion, by episcopal action, within the dioceses of the Continental Church, as now committed to the Vatican decrees. We are not now concerned with the merits of that discussion. But let us hear the committee:

'We feel it our duty to express the opinion that the consecration, by bishops of our communion, of a bishop, to exercise his functions in a foreign country, within the limits of an ancient territorial jurisdiction, and over the natives of that country, is a step of the gravest importance, and fraught with enduring consequences, the issues of which cannot be foreseen. Whilst the rights of bishops of the Catholic Church to interfere under conditions of extreme necessity has always been acknowledged, we deprecate any action that does not carefully regard primitive and established principles of jurisdiction, and the interests of the whole Anglican Communion' (p. 96).

This expression of opinion is summarized in the Resolutions (p. 27); and the Encyclical, in a paragraph relating to 'those Continental movements towards Reformation which, under the greatest difficulties, have proceeded mainly on the same lines as our own, retaining Episcopacy as an Apostolic ordinance,' declares that

'Though we believe that the time has not come for any direct alliance with any of these, and though we deprecate any precipitancy

We refer to the periodical organ of the Spanish and Portuguese Church Aid Society, *Light and Truth*, January and July 1887.

² The Report goes on to express a hope that the Gallican Declaration of 1682, and 'the advances made by Archbishop Wake in correspondence with the Doctors of the Sorbonne towards establishing a basis for intercommunion between the Churches of France and England, may one day again form the basis for hopeful negotiations.' Dr. Pusey would have rejoiced over such words.

of ju sacrifi when be po This reliar is con

or of

T

1888

of ac

a req to co. Unite bury dict t to ha last so bisho; Zinze imper

Orthormagn Wincl communichang and wineeds promoduland in some clause

It shou the que under The cowere un They comen' ha body of a valid do, on y

called the in this operation, Church

VOL

/1 1AA

ct.

S.

sh

ns

ys

he

ey

ie,

ve

re

rd

ns

ch

as

he

he

its

on,

ons

ris-

est

of

the

has

not and

lu-

to ich,

the

olic

rect

ncy

uese

tion

ence

iter-

day

nave

of action which would transgress primitive and established principles of jurisdiction, we believe that advances may be made without sacrifice of these, and we entertain the hope that the time may come when a more formal alliance with some, at least, of these bodies will be possible '(p. 17).

This is such caution as is really brave, because it involves reliance on the abiding force of Catholic principles of order, and is content for their sake to risk the imputation of 'formalism'

or of 'coldness.'

The Moravians' case is referred to in the Resolutions, with a request that 'a committee of bishops should be empowered to confer with learned theologians and with the heads of the Unitas Fratrum, and to report to the Archbishop of Canterbury before the end of the current year' (p. 27). We predict that such a committee will find the 'Brethren' in question to have had no real episcopate, even before the death of their last so-called bishop in 1671. The sanction given by Archbishop Wake and Bishop Wilson to the claims made by Zinzendorf will be found, we believe, to have been based on

imperfect information.1

From the little sect of 'United Brethren' to the 'Holy Orthodox Eastern Church' is indeed a transition of some magnitude. The committee, presided over by the Bishop of Winchester, speaks with respect and tenderness of the great communion whose patriarchs and other prelates have exchanged such friendly greetings with Anglican archbishops, and with the present Bishop of Gibraltar, to whom, we must needs say, Churchmen owe deep thanks for his efforts to promote a better understanding between the East and England in the area of religious life and thought The Report goes some way in an 'Orientalizing' direction with regard to the clause Filioque. 'This clause,' which was 'inserted 2 without

² They say, 'inserted in the Creed of Constantinople, erroneously called the Nicene Creed.' There is a touch of pedantic over-refinement in this description of a symbol which, in its characteristically anti-Arian portion, may with truth be called a recension of the Creed of Nicæa. See

Church Quarterly Review, xvi. 400.

VOL. XXVII.—NO. LIII.

See Dictionary of Sects, Heresies, and Schools of Thought, p. 342. It should be observed that the preceding Lambeth Conference placed the question of the relation of the Anglican Church to the Moravians under consideration of a committee, which never presented a report. The committee of the late Conference, 'in the short time allowed them, were unable to make sufficient inquiry into the details of the subject. They could only say that 'from time to time eminent bishops and Churchmen' had given the Moravians 'the sympathy and support due to a zealous body of Christians imbued with a primitive spirit, and claiming to possess a valid episcopate.' Do they, indeed, make such a claim? and, if they do, on what grounds?

any Conciliar authority' (meaning, without the authority of a General Synod) 'by the Latin Church,' 'which has the prescription of centuries, and is capable of being explained in an orthodox sense, it may be very difficult to remove' (p. 101). Such language, we think, will be found just a little startling. We not only acknowledge, but would assert, that the insertion of the clause was ecclesiastically unlawful; and that this fact ought never to be, as it sometimes has been, evaded or ignored. We presume that the 'orthodox sense' referred to is one which excludes what the Latins have so often disclaimed in discussion with the Greeks, the notion of two 'sources of the Godhead.' But we are left to conjecture as to whether the committee would interpret Filioque of the 'temporal mission, or of an 'eternal procession from the Father through the Son.' And we might have expected an episcopal committee to be more guarded in its reference to a question so grave and so delicate as that of touching the text of the creed of Western Christendom. As matters now stand, we cannot but admit the force of Dr. Liddon's contention, that 'the excision of the Filioque from' the Anglican version of 'the Nicene Creed would erect a fresh barrier between ourselves and the larger portion of Western Christendom,' and 'introduce' (at any rate, for the time) 'confusion of the most painful description into churches of the Anglican communion.'2 In short, as we are not responsible for the insertion, so we are not in a position to annul it without an adequate Western consensus.

Other 'difficulties' mentioned are the Eastern usages as to immersion in baptism, confirmation, and, still more, 'the use of icons,3 the invocation of saints, and the cultus of the Blessed Virgin,' nothing, we observe, being said against Eastern

doctrine about the Eucharist.

The sincerity of Anglican disclaimers of 'proselytism' will hardly be questioned by those who read this Report:

'Your committee would impress upon their fellow-Christians the propriety of abstaining from all efforts to induce individual members of the Orthodox Eastern Church to leave their own communion. If some be dissatisfied with its teaching or usages, and find a lack of

spirit Chur becon as the theor stand

1888

reco shoul the E indivi

'The of R princi care t light a baptis thoug that o before gion, SI

Antic fying T stand made 4 under Aposto defined

Bisho

a reco sixth

affirme

Uı cludin capaci This i

has nev venerat calmnes

1 Th preache

¹ This will be misunderstood by general readers who do not know that Rome for some time objected to the recitation of Filioque; witness Leo III. and his silver tablets. He held the Double Procession to be true, but one of those truths which had not been put by due authority into the Creed.

Report of Bonn Conference, 1875, pref. p. xliii.
 Allowance is made for the natural bias of the second Nicene Council 'against the rationalizing measures, as they were regarded, of the iconoclastic Emperors;' while it is deemed a 'duty to assert that our Church

Oct.

of of

the

ned

(p.

ittle

that

and een,

nse'

ften

truo

s to

em-

ther

opal

n so

reed

nnot

ex-

cene

the

' (at

crip-

hort,

in a

s as

'the

f the

stern

will

as the

mbers inion.

ick of

know

to be

hority

us.

spiritual life in its worship, they should be advised not to leave the Church of their baptism, but, by remaining in it, to endeavour to become centres of life and light to their own people; more especially as the Orthodox Eastern Church has never committed itself to any theory which would make it impossible to reconsider and revise its standards and practice '(p. 102).

In accordance with this, the Conference in its Resolutions 'recommends that the counsels and efforts of our fellow-Christians should be directed to the encouragement of internal reformation in the Eastern Churches, rather than to the drawing away from them of individual members of their communion' (p. 28).

And so in the Encyclical:

'The Eastern Church is reasonably outraged by' the 'proceedings' of Roman proselytisers, 'wholly contrary as they are to Catholic principles; and it behoves us of the Anglican Communion to take care that we do not offend in like manner. Individuals craving fuller light and stronger spiritual life may, by remaining in the Church of their baptism, become centres of enlightenment to their own people. But though all schemes of proselytising are to be avoided, it is only right that our real claims and position as a historical Church should be set before a people who are very distrustful of novelty, especially in religion, and who appreciate the history of Catholic antiquity' (p. 18).

Such pronouncements, we trust, will be of real help to Bishop Blyth in his relations with the Patriarchs of Jerusalem, Antioch, and Alexandria. They will certainly be most gratifying to Catholic-minded Churchmen at home.

The last of the Reports is concerned with 'authoritative standards of faith and worship.' It reaffirms the declaration

made at former conferences as to union

'under one Divine Head, in the fellowship of the one Catholic and Apostolic Church, holding the one faith revealed in Holy Writ, defined in the Creeds, maintained by the primitive Church, and affirmed by the undisputed "Œcumenical" Councils,'

a recognition explained as, in effect, including the fifth and sixth Councils in its scope (p. 106).

Unfortunately, neither a committee nor a Conference including American prelates can be understood in its collective capacity to include the *Quicunque vult* among the creeds. This is not the fault of the bishops recently assembled; it

has never accepted the teaching of that Council in reference to the veneration of sacred pictures.' Here, again, is the language of dignified calmness, instead of such as ultra-Protestants might have used.

¹ The Report here quotes, in a note, the famous canon 'about

preachers,' and I Eliz. i. c. 36.

C 2

ouncil iconohurch

YHM

was unfortunately involved in the very idea of a consultative meeting in which the American Church was to be represented. Accordingly the *Quicunque* is referred to (not without warrant¹) as a 'hymn,' and the committee (in which sat three bishops from the United States, besides two from Ireland) emphatically accepts it under that name,

'whether or not recited in the public worship of our churches, as resting upon certain warrant of Scripture, and as most useful, both at home and in our missions, in ascertaining and defining the fundamental mysteries of the Holy Trinity and of the Incarnation, . . .

and thus guarding believers from lapsing into heresy.

'In relation to the doctrine of the Procession of the Holy Spirit, while we believe that there is no fundamental diversity of faith between the Churches of the East and West, we recognize the historical fact that the clause *Filioque* makes no part of the Nicene Symbol, as set forth by the authority of the undivided Church.'

'We are of opinion that, as opportunity arises, it would be well to revise the English version of the Nicene Creed and of the Quicunque

vult' (p. 107).

Of these three statements the Resolutions notice only the third, and adopt it in a more tentative form. The Archbishop of Canterbury is requested 'to take counsel with such persons as he may see fit to consult, with a view to ascertaining whether it is desirable to revise the English version of the Nicene Creed or of the Quicunque vult' ('carried by 57 votes to 20,' p. 28). Now we do not well understand what was the

¹ Keble, in the Lyra Apostolica, called it a 'psalm'; and Cardinal Newman, in the Grammar of Assent, emphasizes this mediæval description of it, when he speaks of it as 'a psalm or hymn of praise, of confession, and of profound self-prostrating homage.' It was not, of course, compiled as a hymn, but rather as an 'expositio fidei catholicæ;' hence it was sometimes called a 'sermo.' And, abating the error as to its authorship, we cannot but acquiesce in the statement of St. Thomas (Secunda Secunda, i. 10. 3), 'Athanasius non composuit manifestationem fidei per modum symboli, sed magis per modum cujusdam doctrinæ; ut ex ipso

modo loquendi apparet.'

² The Report here refers to the proceedings of the Bonn Conference of 1875. But the final agreement, on that occasion, was only reached by admitting into the doctrinal statement certain words of John of Damascus, 'the Holy Spirit of God the Father, as proceeding from Him, which is also called the Spirit of the Son, as manifested and imparted to the creation through Him, but not having His existence from Him' (Report of Bonn Conference, p. 104). This was, pro tanto, a victory for the Orientals; for although Dr. Liddon suggests in his preface that the Conference was 'not strictly committed to the texts extracted from St. John of Damascus,' it is clear from Dr. Döllinger's recorded words that the Orientals' assent to the proposition, 'The Holy Ghost issues out of the Father through the Son,' was to be understood in the sense of the words above quoted.

whic to pr and such for ' Son' or, pe sertic and ' of 'fi be ra now s conje tions. the 'r Chalc fact t fraudi langua versio of Ch origina were t that th disquie tion. might word ' 'world into 'e and th

1888

purp

welcome to touch no party panic, of August question will be means: we cannot the Man

modern

howeve

purpose of this suggestion. As to the Quicunque, a committee which spoke so worthily of its doctrinal value could not intend to prepare the way for its disuse in our English Church service; and a revised version of the original Latin could only make such changes as the substitution of 'would' for 'will,' or 'eternal' for 'everlasting,' or of 'was made' for 'is made,' or 'and the Son' for 'and of the Son,' or of 'severally' for 'by Himself,' or, perhaps, of 'infinite' for 'incomprehensible,' and the insertion of 'He is' before 'God, of the substance of the Father,' and 'Man, of the substance of His Mother,' and the addition of 'firmly' to 'faithfully'; unless, indeed, questions were to be raised as to the structural unity of the Latin text as it now stands; or unless favour were to be shown to Dr. Neale's conjecture that 'solo' and 'et Filio' are ancient interpolations.1 But as to the Niceno-Constantinopolitan Creed, is the 'revision' to represent the Greek text as sanctioned at Chalcedon, and thus to bring home to English readers the fact that the Filioque was a gloss which was introduced, not fraudulently but ignorantly, under the influence of Augustinian language, by Spanish bishops into their copies of the Latin version? Or is it intended, furthermore, to prepare the minds of Churchmen, by familiarity with the exact rendering of the original, for an ultimate 'removal' of the interpolation? It were to be wished that the committee, and, for that matter, that the Conference, had seen fit to preclude uncertainty and disquiet,2 on so important a point, by a few words of explanation. Doubtless, apart from this question, the 'Nicene Creed' might be more accurately represented in English. word 'of' is not now satisfactory as an equivalent for êk, and 'worlds' might well be altered into 'ages,' and 'substance' into 'essence;' 'the' is certainly needed before 'Giver of life;' and the omission of 'holy' between 'one' and 'Catholic,' however it may be accounted for, must be regarded as unfaithful. Of course a proper punctuation would place a semi-

1 Neale, Introd. Hist. East. Ch. ii. 1159.

ed. arree nd)

. as

h at

oct.

ive

oirit, berical

l, as ell to nque

the shop sons ning the otes the

edinal scriponfesourse, hence athorcunda ei per x ipso

rence
nched
f DaHim,
rted to
Him'
ry for
at the
om St.
s that

out of

of the

VIIM

We must needs think the Dean of Manchester very ill-advised in 'welcoming the spontaneous and unexpected decision of the bishops to touch the question of the Creeds under no pressure, and in obedience to no party cry, as affording a hope of a safe escape, without clamour or panic, out of a real practical difficulty' (see report in Guardian of August 22). What does Dean Oakley understand by 'touching the question of the Creeds'? We know pretty well where and how his words will be 'welcomed.' They will be taken to mean more than, we trust, he means: more, certainly, than the Conference documents warrant. And we cannot but feel some anxiety as to certain words in the programme of the Manchester Church Congress—'the adaptation of the . . . Creeds to modern needs.'

colon before, if not both before and after, 'by Whom all things were made.'

The question of the relation of 'newly-constituted Churches. particularly in non-Christian lands,' to the Anglican 'standards' of doctrine and worship, occupies the next section of the same committee's Report. 'The Sacramental offices and the Ordinal' should not, they suggest, be 'materially' altered without the virtual assent of 'the whole communion.' Greater freedom is deemed admissible with regard to other offices. The Thirtynine Articles are described as, 'for the most part, accurate in their language, and reserved and moderate in their definitions.' 'The omission of a few clauses in a few Articles' would remove all 'imputation of injustice or harshness. At the same time we feel that the Articles are not all of equal value, that they are not, and do not profess to be, a complete statement of Christian doctrine' (p. 110). It is recommended that missionary Churches should not be 'recognized as in complete intercommunion with our own,' except on condition of their adopting 'Articles in accordance with the positive statements of our own standards.'

Again we feel that such language indicates a very considerable advance beyond the point at which Anglican bishops would some years ago have taken stand, when the Thirty-nine Articles were in question. The Conference, briefly in its Resolutions, more fully in its Encyclical, endorses the views herein expressed. Another significant feature of the Encyclical is the precedency given among 'standards of doctrine and worship' to 'the Prayer-Book with its Catechism, and the Ordinal,'

before the Articles (p. 18).

We have now completed our survey of the proceedings of this remarkable Conference; and, while we have freely commented on certain utterances which appear to us more or less ill-advised—and are also painfully sensible of the contrast between its exhortations to reunion, or hopes of intercommunion, and the renewal of a war à outrance on the part of Puritanical 'irreconcilables,' indicative of deep divisions on principle not disguised by litigation about externals,—it is, nevertheless, matter of solid satisfaction to observe in the general character of the Lambeth Resolutions and Encyclical that fidelity which bishops, beyond all men, owe to theological traditions that pertain to the continuity of the Church.

ART A S

1888

THIS Theo quen a han comn which prece these profo leanes fresh its 'in conta the th the se archet must o selves our et into the ception true th imposs ideas. nature if it pe most : source power knowle in which his wo questio how we tineau

over ag

ART. II.-MARTINEAU'S STUDY OF RELIGION.

A Study of Religion: its Sources and Contents. By JAMES MARTINEAU, D.D., LL.D., late Principal of Manchester New College, London. (Oxford, 1888.)

THIS great work forms a sister treatise to the Types of Ethical Theory, and the author has dispensed his rich stores of eloquence and learning upon the theme of Religion with as lavish a hand as upon that of morals. The reader will find, at the commencement of the present work, an account of the reasons which prescribed to him this order of treatment, and gave precedence to the question of ethics. We are bound to say that these reasons do not seem to us wholly decisive. It is indeed profoundly true that without morals religion is 'presented in the leanest condition, without any resource for investing it with fresh plenitude and grace' (i. 18); that the conscience, with its 'intuition of what ought to be, beyond anything that is, has contact with a mystery' (i. 22), and reveals to us, 'not simply the thought of one mind, but the relation between two, both the seat of the same conscious moral order, the one its infinite archetype, the other the finite image' (i. 23); that 'ethics must either perfect themselves in religion, or degrade themselves into Hedonism' (i. 26); and that the very inability which our ethics in their present earthly form experience in passing into the transcendent sphere of religion 'opens up the conception and belief of a life beyond the present '(i. 32). It is also true that, when we come to treat of the *contents* of religion, it is impossible to display them without constant resort to moral ideas. For in the adaptation of religion to man's moral nature its chief wealth consists, and the practice of religion, if it possess any reality, employs man's moral nature as its most indispensable instrument. But when you trace the sources of religion, as Dr. Martineau with such irresistible power traces them, to the primary conditions of human knowledge, and the necessary relations of man to the world in which he lives, it would seem plain that this department of his work is in its nature prior to the subject of morals. question how we know anything must precede the question how we know right from wrong. And accordingly, Dr. Martineau is compelled, in the progress of his present work, to go over again the field of ethics, and recapitulate much of what he has said in the previous treatise. It would be impertinent

rds 'me

ct.

ngs

the om tyin ons.'

reame that ment misolete heir ents

nonsihops nine lesoerein s the ship' inal,'

gs of comr less strast nmurt of as on it is, n the relical

ogical

VIIM

to

h

a

it

d

th

uj

it

id

pe

us

D

th

or

th

'a

ga

the

ax

Do

un

we

ay

nig

pho

wit

'H

WI

sec

the

All

tion

and

to s

sch

eigl

in us to suggest the welding of the two works into one; but it is no harm to say that a reader bent on mastering them both would not do ill if he began with the first volume of the *Study of Religion*, and read the earlier treatise in connexion with that division of the present work which treats of the conscience and its testimony to its author. Each work is splendid by itself, but the union of the two forms one of our

noblest monuments of intellect and spiritual power.

It will be gathered, from what we have already said, that in tracing the sources of religion Dr. Martineau makes long and patient use of those philosophical gifts in which no contemporary excels him. He is right; and no one who declines to follow him can make any claim to have dug the foundation of his religious philosophy to the requisite depth. The details of the dealings of God and man must be in their nature dependent upon the powers which man possesses of coming into contact with God; and how, except by the aid of philosophy, can these be stated? No such effectual answer can be made to the sceptic as the proof that the powers which enable us to know anything, even our own ignorance, lead us necessarily beyond that prison-room of sense in which he asserts us to be confined. Dr. Martineau introduces his work by an apposite anecdote of a Positivist, who pronounced that 'you cannot make the slightest concession to metaphysics without ending in a theology.' Good proof that, if we enter these dark passages with a proper guide, we need not fear that we shall be left in them; we shall but traverse them to reach a higher position and a clearer air than that in which we find ourselves now.

And let not the reader tremble. He will find that this long metaphysical journey is wonderfully enlivened by the eloquence of his author. We find it hard to express our admiration of the copiousness of imagery and powers of amplification by which Dr. Martineau entices us to dwell upon difficult distinctions until we have insensibly come to understand them, and solaces us with the delights of poetry without ever losing the precision of prose. His style in its splendour and surprising turns of illustration, reminds us not seldom of Jeremy Taylor and his stately periods, as when we read that 'the rule of right, the symmetries of character, the requirements of perfection, are no provincialisms of this planet. They are known among the stars; they reign beyond Orion and the Southern Cross; they are wherever the universal Spirit is; and no subject-mind, though it fly on one track for ever, can escape beyond their bounds' (i. 28); or, in treating of

50s.

intr

the teleology of the human eye, are reminded that 'it is not required that we should count the stars of the Milky Way, or make portraits of the people of Jupiter, or classify the minerals

of the moon ' (i. 361).

We have not only Dr. Martineau's eloquence, but his wit to bear us company and to beguile the way. Would Mr. Mill help us to attain the knowledge of an external world by assuring us that other people have the same sensations of it as ourselves, Dr. Martineau replies: 'Till we have got the door open out of our own egoistic chamber, and found that there is a field beyond, it is premature to serve a summons upon inconceivable people there to come and bear witness to its existence. . . . Over this impassable chasm, cutting off the idealist from the negative of self, Mr. Mill ventures on his personal leap. But he does not help us to follow him, or tell us how he manages to leave himself behind him' (i. 107-8). Does Mr. Darwin trace the cuckoo's uninvited occupation of the nests of other birds to the perpetuation of a mistake originally made by one of the species, Dr. Martineau remarks that, if a casual slip can thus be stereotyped and transmitted, 'a gentleman knocking at the wrong door for a dinner engagement, and shown into the drawing-room, might become the founder of a new race, with whom it would be a moral axiom to entertain everybody's guest but your own' (i. 286). Do we find people complaining of the unfilled space in the universe as a blemish in nature; 'as if,' says our author, 'space were a precious bit of City building ground, a hundred guineas a yard, in dealing with which the architect is bound to be very niggard in economy' (i. 355). Dr. Bain would resolve the phenomena of the will into the contest of opposing motives within us, to the strongest of which we must yield ourselves. ' How,' asks Dr. Martineau, 'do they manage this experiment? What is going on during this pause? He does not reveal the secret. It is a battle in the dark, or behind the scenes, as in the classic drama, that lets no horrors come upon the stage. All we know is that at last the door is opened, and the volition, stepping into the daylight, reports which is the victor and which is the slain' (ii. 234). We must leave the reader to study and interpret for himself the parable of the boardingschool at which, whenever at full moon the thermometer at eight A.M. is below 45°, and the price of corn not more than 50s. per quarter, there is plum pudding for dinner instead of apple dumpling (ii. 244).

But one more humorous page we must notice, because it introduces us straight into our subject; that, namely, in which

our that ong conines tion

tails

ture

Oct.

but

nem the

cion

the c is

ning hilon be able ecesserts y an

hout these at we ach a find

this v the ir admpliupon ınderithout ndour eldom read r, the fthis eyond versal ck for

ting of

b

b

b

a

tl

tl

e

th

aı

id

Ol

th

no

th

W

G

an

H

kn

for

sci

sci

en

to

to

ou

his

of !

me

wh

Agnosticism is described as posting a notice at the very approach to our inquiry that there is no way through.

'This doctrine of nescience professes to be the result of an exhaustive scrutiny of the cognitive faculties, and an exact measurement of their resources against the objects to which they may address themselves. These processes of psychological stock-taking we have apparently as much reason to dread as the mismanaging director to shrink from the audit of his accounts. For somehow they are always disclosing bad debts, and reducing our intellectual capital nearer to bankruptcy' (i. 37).

We have then, if we may further apply Dr. Martineau's image, to make up the spiritual accounts of the soul, and appraise our intellectual assets at their proper and permanent value. We have to disregard temporary depreciations, to which even the best securities are liable, and to remember not only that many fortunes have been lost by investing in stocks which had no real values behind them, but many fortunes gained through buying up in evil days the genuine scrip which is sure to rise. It is a matter of course that in commencing this investigation Dr. Martineau should address himself to Kant's theory of the grounds and limits of human knowledge, and in chap, i. of the first book we have accordingly a succinct account of that great thinker's survey of man's intellectual powers. They are incapable, he tells us, of furnishing any materials to our belief beyond the limits of the world of sense. They can but manipulate and arrange the images that reach it from the outer world, and are endowed with powers for this limited purpose. But beyond this earthly sphere the understanding cannot reach, and whatever imaginations and illusions may float around it and seem to enlarge its view into regions which are supernatural and eternal are really only derived from earthy sources, bearing earth's stamp of transitoriness and limitation. In the following chapter Dr. Martineau comments upon Kant's doctrine, and justifies it with certain important modifications as sufficient to give an intelligible account of our belief in the existence of an external material world.

In the hands of the followers of Kant his system was divested of the doctrines which still separated it from pure idealism. And the mind which already was responsible for all the form and colour of the things of which it thinks was required to make itself responsible for the very existence of the things themselves, as a creditor who has already seized upon all the furniture of the house might at last be requested to take possession of the house itself. Nor, indeed, is it easy to say what the 'thing in itself' in which Kant retained his

wh rela

enti into sess ever

MIIX

5-

of 1-

re.

to

ys

to

l'S

nd

nt

to

ot

ks

es

ch

ng

to

ge,

nct

ual

ny

se.

ach

his

er-

ons

ons

ved

ess

om-

im-

unt

was

oure

for

was

e of

ized

sted

easy

his

d.

belief as something existing outside the understanding, may be, or what title it can present to our recognition of its existence when it is supposed to be divested even of any connexion with time or with space. And, therefore, our self is presented by Fichte as the sole author and proprietor of the world and all things in it. But this is too much wealth: it oppresses the possessor. When we find ourselves creators of everything that we think about we feel like greedy feeders who have eaten up everything before us, and are conscious of a surfeit without at the same time seeing where we are to find another And Schelling helps us to bear our burden by showing that we are not merely individuals, but merged in the absolute and universal mind, in the power of which our intellects create for themselves this wonderful world. Hegel pursues the same idea so far as to represent the things on which we look as, like ourselves who look on them, phases of the universal reason thought and life as one continual passage of the self into the not-self, and of the not-self into the self. In Schopenhauer the understanding looks on in helpless despair upon the blind work of will, which is not a free faculty either of man or of God, but another name for the material frame of the world and of man rushing horribly forward into ever greater misery. Hartmann reunites the will with the understanding, and acknowledges that nature displays not merely blind force, but force directed to a purpose; but the force in nature is unconscious, and we ourselves, endowed with the fatal gift of consciousness, find ourselves in the grasp of an awful power, endowed with illimitable force, patience, and ingenuity, directed to ends which are chosen at random, without reference either to its own happiness or to ours. Mr. Mill elaborately explains our belief in the world about us by assuming as the basis of his explanations the very belief which he professes to explain.

This long and varied history of thought leaves behind it at all events one great and permanent lesson—the relativity of human knowledge, a doctrine foreshadowed indeed in some measure by the ancients, but in our time extended to the whole sphere of thought. And Dr. Martineau gives a wholesome admonition when he reminds us that the law of

relativity

^{&#}x27;tells impartially on the whole field claimed by the human intellect. . . . It is commonly assumed that only metaphysical and theological entities are affected by this law, and that while it despatches them into the limbo of vanity it instals the scientific conceptions in possession of the field which they vacate. . . . This assumption is, however, absolutely baseless. If I am at the mercy of my own intellectual

constitution when I trust my idea of Space, of Substance, or of Cause, and of my moral constitution when I accept the reality of Obligation, I am no less at the mercy of my percipient constitution when I register as fact the forms, the weights, the features, the movements of the physical world ' (i. 120).

In either case we have something which we can know, but it is known to us only through our acceptance of the mystery on which all knowledge depends. Many people in these times gaily go forth into the world of observation and of science, and from those interesting fields look back with great contempt upon those who are still struggling with the mental difficulties involved in the nature of our minds and their primary contact with outward things, and with their own mysterious source. And they forget that they have got leave to employ themselves upon their various pursuits only on those conditions which apply to all thought, and that if they refuse to accept these conditions they are certain to go wrong in the application of anything they have seemed to learn, to

human life and its uses.

The world of change with which we make acquaintance and the changing reflections of it in our minds within, are not merely change. The very word 'change' which we apply to them implies that there is a 'permanent ground, the correlative of changes' (i. 126). We distribute the succession of sights and sounds in the outward world along an 'underlying line of duration which holds them;' we distribute our own acts and experiences as we remember them upon the ground of our personality. 'Phenomena and noumena'-appearances which the senses recognize, and the underlying ground beneath appearances which the mind is forced to believe inare inseparable companions on the field of intelligence. The appearances are known; they form the subject of all our knowledge. Can, then, that something which we know to lie beneath them be pronounced either unknown or unknowable? Unknowable is the favourite designation which a certain class of philosophers apply to the 'power' from which all things issue. Dr. Martineau well remarks that, by calling this existence a power, Mr. Herbert Spencer surely removes it by one mark from the unknown; but, besides this, 'we are obliged,' he says, 'to regard that power as omniscient, as eternal, as one, as cause manifested in all phenomena—a list of predicates, scanty indeed when measured by the requisites of religion, but too copious for the plea of nescience i (i. 131). And this brings us face to face with the question of God. That is the name which in all past ages and everywhere throughout the world

eart ima phe not

its " it bu

fa

S

S

W

T

th

th

me

va

tor

Dr

say

· T

con

rus

driv

We only phei nom expe

for e we fi the :

e,

ts

ut

ry

es e,

n-

al eir

vn ve

on ey

ng to

ice

not

to

ela-

of ing

wn und

ices

be-

n-

The

our

lie

ble?

lass sue.

ce a nark

says,

e, as

anty

t too rings

name

vorld

has been applied to the cause of all things; and before we can consent to exchange this name with the associations of life and love which it carries with it for the term 'unknowable.' which puts away from us all knowledge of life or love in the universal cause as impossible, it becomes us well to examine what we mean by a cause, and whether that which we acknow-

ledge as cause can be either lifeless or unknown.

We find ourselves in the first place applying the term 'cause' to things; one of which we say is the cause of another. What do we mean? Is it our belief that things, by the mere fact of being things, are the causes of other things, or even the cause of our own perception of their own existence? Not Things are not causes except by means of some power which they exert and some relation in which they stand. Shall we, then, so far correct our impressions as to regard things as a series of phenomena, in which we find a constant succession invariably renewing itself as matter of fact, though without ever enabling us to know or guess why it does so? This reduction of causality to mere apposition in time appears to many thinkers a satisfactory account of all we know about the matter. But few unprejudiced persons who reflect what they mean by the words 'cause and effect' will grant it to be merely this, that when one phenomenon has appeared and vanished and left nothing of itself remaining they are accustomed to expect that another will appear. We must allow Dr. Martineau to be speaking for the general mind when he says that

'The blow of the steam-hammer which welds two masses of iron, the combustion of the furnace which runs the metal out of the ore, the rush of the torrent which buries a homestead in gravel, the gale which drives the ship upon the rocks, the summer warmth which decks the earth with foliage and flowers, are hardly reducible, even in the imagination of an empirical philosopher, to mere pioneers of the phenomena they announce. Their relation to what follows is that not of prophecy but of production; it is their "effect" and they are its "efficients;" they not only give notice of but do it; not only do it but necessitate it ' (i. 155).

We can, to be sure, learn by experience, and by experience only, what effects they are which will flow from any particular phenomena, and what the causes are of any particular phenomena of which we have experience. And we find that our experiments of this nature yield us information which serves for every similar case as it recurs. But were it otherwise—did we find that there was no order in the world's events but that the same phenomena were constantly followed by different

successors, we should still be unable to consider the latter as uncaused. We cannot, therefore, deduce from the uniformity of nature a belief which would cleave to us though no such uniformity existed. And the impossibility of dispensing with dynamical conceptions in nature is witnessed to by the modern doctrine of the persistence and metamorphosis of forces, which

links them all into a system (i. 171).

But the fact is that, in order to know what the essential conception of causality is, we must not take up the position of mere spectators, before whose eyes an endless procession of events pass on. That is not our relation to the world and its history. We are not mere spectators of it. We mingle in it as living beings. Every event which becomes known to us has in it something of ourselves. It comes to us through our own perception, and we cannot know what it is apart from our perception of it. It is in our perception of things that our notion of cause lies hid. In our perceptions our own Ego, our own self endowed with reason and will, is ever at What perception may be to animals lower in the scale of creation, or in what degree these animals have any beginnings of our faculties, are questions which do not here concern us. We are not, and we cannot make ourselves to be, mere passive recipients of impressions from without. Our rational nature goes forth to meet the world we live in, but is incapable of manufacturing a world for itself; 'it is the encounter and strife of centrifugal and centripetal movements' (i. 197), of the experiences which our senses bring in, and the faculties which our living nature exerts, that put us in our connexion with the world. There is no moment of life in which we fill the place either of active minds without anything to act on, or of passive recipients without making any response to impressions. And here, says Dr. Martineau, we reach the cradle of our idea of cause and effect.

'If the foregoing exposition is correct, the Ego and the non-Ego are known to us *ab initio* as reciprocally limiting powers put forth by antagonist agents and operating change in some recipient object. If I know myself at all, it is in trying with all my might to do something needed but difficult, to heave away a retarding resistance; nor does anything sooner bring home to me the poise and counterpoise between self and nature than the attempt to shut a door against a furious wind' (i. 199).

This is an extreme instance of poise and counterpoise, but something essentially the same is felt in every instance of perception, how small soever. We still find the living powers which we put forth met by something which reacts upon us, a fi li fi

in

an

ne be to Ar to we ope Th

in mis beli and surr qua dead

or

selv

the readiscient of its thing

carri

circu

and thus makes itself perceived. This is the experience that gives the child its first notions of an external world to which it at first attributes the same life as it feels in itself. And although this impression alters, and we no longer beat the chairs and tables for hurting us, yet the nature of our intercourse with the world about us remains essentially the same to the last. Even the feelings of anger or love to external things or events are often present to show that we know them as reactions to our own living powers; and where these feelings are absent the same sense of a correspondence and a likeness between us and the world we live in is rather pushed further back than wholly unfelt.

'To the world we are introduced, not as to a dead thing or material aggregate of things, but to another Self, just as causal as we, instinct with hidden Will, and so far presenting the outer and the

inner spheres in true equipoise' (i. 202).

'The notion "cause," then, takes its form from the fundamental antithesis and correspondence of the Ego and the non-Ego, revealed in percipience as the constituents of one whole, the key to which is necessarily found in the home-factor. Here we learn what it is to be a cause. It presupposes, because it controls, immanent power, to which by an act of the will it gives a selected direction' (i. 211).

And as we find it in our own wills to give a selected direction to the inward powers by which we explore the world, so do we recognize in the reaction of the world upon them the operation of a will which gives a selected direction to these. This is what has led men so universally to the belief in divine power exerted in the world, and working, whether in harmony or resistance, opposite to the human powers which they themselves put forth. Life and nature are an education to man in divesting this primary conception of superstitions and mistakes, but not in removing it. Man cannot unlearn the belief that reason and will answer from without to the reason and will which he exerts from within, except at the price of surrendering his belief in his own genuine possession of those qualities. If he reduces the world of his experience to a dead world, it will ever be found that he has reduced his own life to a dead thing too, and has come to regard himself as carried forward without will by the forces of nature and circumstance. If we listen to the true education of nature,

'the human mind is led over the whole interval between its first reading of divine motives in everything and its latest version of scientific causation without being called on to part from the essence of its original faith. From Will at the fountain-head not a single thing is deducted at any stage of the process: only the inner acts of

e, but ace of owers on us,

n

h

al

n

n

nd

in us

ur

m

nat

wn

at

the

iny

ere

; to

Dur

t is

the

nts'

the

our

e in

any-

any

, we

-Ego

th by

. If

thing

XUM

that will are thrown into a new order, are reduced to a few comprehensive heads, and organized into a system of which the sciences are the reflection in little. The emergence from superstition which marks this process consists, not in the expulsion of purpose from any scene which it occupied before, but in the substitution of larger purpose for less, of plan for impulse. And as the primitive power has not been lost on the way, neither has any other been found: so that we are still in presence of the originating Mind, whose organizing thoughts are prototypes of the rules of nature' (i. 245).

The belief in intelligent will as the originating principle of the world is beyond doubt the simplest and easiest solution of the question. We should willingly quote, did space permit, the wise and witty passage in which Dr. Martineau describes the difficulties of the atomic theory, and ask by what rule of science can it be called a modest act to take for granted all possible velocities and all possible directions and an unlimited store of bodies, identical in size and shape, to move in them? (i. 249). If anywhere, he says, in nature beyond our own case we encounter characteristics which are possible only to intention, so far we are driven to resort to that full type of Now, the problem whether we can trust the external signs of invisible will is familiar to us in one important case, namely, the doings of our fellow-men (i. 261). There cannot be a more fruitful suggestion of thought than that which the author makes when he sets us upon this line. For though there is much to say for the theory that our fellow-men are automata, and that we should treat them as such, yet, says Dr. Martineau, we ascribe most of their conduct to minds like our own, while we ascribe most of the behaviour of the lower animals to unthinking instinct. And in both instances we are applying to other cases inferences drawn from our own The automatic instincts which we attribute to the lower creatures, no less than the reason and will of which we suppose our fellow-men possessed, are the extension to them of our own experiences—an experience, in the one case, of acts which we automatically perform without reason, without consciousness; and, in the other, of other acts which we do with choice and with reason conscious of itself. Nor can our recognition of either of these outward repetitions of our own inward life be justified except on grounds more applicable to the signs of God's presence in His world. In fact, it is not possible for us to give ourselves any account of anything that goes on without, except in terms derived from our inward experience. And therefore the charge of anthropomorphism, so commonly made against Theism, is futile.1 The blind

ford thir be we our

188

thes the of the repli in it forth

telec as w histo facts creat scien first a would less p which chanc which of the which delibe They of the equip compu tion fo operat pause to ext so wor dark a betwee betwee to a m butes i of prof

of feeli

other (

¹ See a careful discussion of the term 'anthropomorphism,' i. 333 seqq.

t.

2-

re

h

er

er

so

ng

le

on

it,

es

of

all

ed

n?

wn

to

of

nal

se,

not-

the

ıgh

are

avs

ike

wer

we

nwo

the

we

nem

e, of

nout

do

our

own

e to

not

that

ward

nism,

blind

segq.

force to which we should have to ascribe the formation of things, if we refused to name the name of God, would in truth be quite as anthropomorphic as the Reason and Will which we ascribe to Him, only derived from inferior departments of our self-experience.

But, setting aside this taunt, we come to inquire which of these anthropomorphic experiences of ours, the blind force or the intelligent will, it is most reasonable to choose as the type of the creative power that works in the universe. The latter, replies Dr. Martineau, because we find this power displaying in its work all the signs which our intelligence and will put forth, and by which we recognize them for what they are.

Here, then, we are launched into the great question of teleology. In his treatment of it Dr. Martineau shows himself as well acquainted with the most recent researches in natural history as he is with the metaphysicians, and able to tell his facts in animal life with that affectionate interest in the lower creatures which possesses so great a charm. Among the scientists themselves it is pretty well known that more was at first ascribed by Darwin to natural selection than the theory would bear, and that, while the struggle for existence doubtless performs a vast work in preserving those characteristics which are best fitted to hold their own, something more than chance must be looked to as the source of the equipment which is thus put to the proof. The creatures in their defence of themselves against each other are not left to the weapons which they may pick up at hazard upon the ground, but are deliberately armed by their mother nature for the combat. They could not otherwise be provided as they are. The age of the universe, vast as it is, does not afford time for the equipment of the creatures by chance. Mr. A. W. Bennett computes in a particular instance the prospects of perpetuation for an organic specialty produced by natural selection operating on a chance variation (i. 280). But we cannot pause to epitomise these deeply interesting pages, nor even to extract the beautiful description of the human eye and ear, so wondrously adapted for light and sound, yet formed in the dark and silent chamber of the womb, and the contrast between the faith which ascribes this pre-established harmony between elements that have no acquaintance with each other to a mind which embraces them both, and that which attributes it to the chance effects of sunshine and air on a mass of protoplasm or primordial jelly in tickling it into some sort of feeling by the play of the one and the vibrations of the other (i. 306).

VOL. XXVII.—NO. LIII.

Dr. Martineau next proceeds to consider the objections to teleology. First, that suggested by Kant, that no cause operating within nature in conformity with its general laws can also be the principle which gives origin to nature. To which it is replied that the dictum is arbitrary, and the contradictory principle, that the originating cause must be like those secondary causes which it sets at work, is quite as easy to believe, and has, in fact, been believed by an immense majority of thinkers; and, again, that the dictum is equally directed against all theories as to the cause of things, for it is not possible to suggest any cause which does not resemble some which we see at work within the existing system of things. But Kant proceeds further to argue that the argument from design does not introduce us to an Absolute Being, but to an architect of the universe working upon existing materials and under limitations. And here Dr. Martineau allows that the philosopher is right. The argument from design aims only at showing the operation of mind in nature, and the idea of absolute mind operating without conditions is a contradiction. We must, therefore, acknowledge that we cannot thus attain the absolute. At the same time the conditions under which mind in nature works are not hereby proved to have any other origin than itself, any more than a sculptor who had the power of calling into being the materials on which he works would be the less an artist (i. 328).

The final objection to teleology which Dr. Martineau considers is that of the alleged blemishes in nature. There he finds plentiful scope for his loving interest in nature and animate life in justifying the ways of God to man. Nowhere do we find him declining to look facts in the face, yet he advances everywhere such thoughtful presentations of the good to be found even in things evil, as may well make this portion of his work a manual of comfort to distressed souls as well as a source of devout thought to every mind which does not demand a perfection in the world inconsistent with the exist-

ence of finite wills.

And now the great question comes up, What attributes can we ascribe to God when we regard Him as the cause of the phenomena of the world? In the first place, replies Dr. Martineau, we must invest Him with All Power: not a metaphysical omnipotence, but all power the existence of which does not imply a contradiction. And next, we ascribe to Him unity. The power in which the laws of our nature compel us to believe is the counterpart of our own. Now it is the essence of our personal consciousness to retain its unity through all

experience leads again of divided the uproduce exist sent. creed tion (cause scient)

wisdo

were v

So

1888

we are oblige them a The re irresis of rea to our leads 1 but ec copiou tration nothin from t the im chief le from e first I if surp expres: ence I of the 1

Is t society for ma original interest slightes nature experiences. That highest Power to which our consciousness leads us must reflect the same character. The logical rule against multiplying causes looks the same way. A plurality of divine beings affords us no further resources for explaining the constitution of the world. Nor will the physical unity of the universe admit the supposition of any partnership in its production. And as it is inconceivable that anything should exist outside the range of the Universal Cause, He is omnipresent. But we had better state, in Dr. Martineau's own words, the creed which forms the result of his long and patient investigation of the principle of causality. 'There is one universal cause the infinite and eternal seat of all power, an omniscient mind ordering all things for ends selected with perfect wisdom.'

So far are we conducted by our intellectual faculties, and were we merely beings of intellect, here we should stop. But we are not merely intellectual, we are moral beings. We are obliged to listen to our moral intuitions, and we all regard them as guides to truth in our intercourse with our fellow-men. The relations of our will to the outward world lead us by an irresistible impulse, justified, if need be, by an irresistible chain of reasoning, to an objective causality corresponding without to our wills within. Our moral experience, in like manner, leads us to an objective authority, and here, too, our reasoning but echoes the general voice of the human conscience. copious learning of Dr. Martineau often furnishes some illustration of his positions from an unexpected source, and nothing can be more striking than the passage here extracted from the great French jurist Michelet, in which he describes the impression made upon him by the recurring identity of the chief legal symbols and ideas among nations the most distant from each other: 'To me it was a sublime experience when first I heard this universal chorus. So world-wide an accord, if surprising in languages, was profoundly touching to me in expressions of Right. . . . From my little momentary existence I touched, unworthy though I be, the eternal communion of the human race' (ii. 5).

Is this universal sense of a moral authority the creation of society? We can understand how society can create a must for man, but not how it can create an ought. Out of an original seed of self-love it is impossible to believe that disinterested love of right can spring. Nor, indeed, have we the slightest reason to think that the original motive power of our nature is that of self-love. 'Instead of admitting that pleasure

D 2

V

s to percan hich tory ond-

Oct

ieve, ty of ected s not some sings. from

to an s and at the only dea of action.

attain which e any ad the works

There and owhere he ade good portion well as oes not e exist-

tributes ause of lies Dr. a metaof which to Him empel us essence ough all

Oct.

188

sets up all our springs of action, I affirm that the springs of

action set up all our pleasures.'

Dr. Martineau, therefore, repudiates the supposed development of conscience from original pleasures and pains, gradually transformed by the occasions of social life. But he is very far from denying that there has been a development of conscience. As it plainly and in common experience develops in the individual, so also in the race—only it must develop from principles which are fitted to produce it. 'My protest,' says Dr. Martineau, 'against James Mill's theory is not that he evolves conscience instead of treating it as innate, but that what he evolves is not conscience at all' (ii. 26). The original germ of conscience contains in it the sense of relation to God as authority and of duty owed to Him, just as we have found the original germ of our sense of God's power in the feeling that our will is encountered by another will in our first experience of an external world.

In a singularly beautiful passage, the Christian application of which it is hard to miss, Dr. Martineau reminds us that for our true moral life we are ever dependent upon the presence of some character higher than our own, the realization of our inward idea, the presentation to us in the flesh of the divine

source of goodness:

'If your whole past could be laid open, where would you find its moments of purest consecration, of fresh insight into duty, and willing love to follow it? Not, I believe, when you were criticising a creed or constructing a philosophy, though with the simplest aim at truth; not when working out the contents of some comprehensive precept, though you owned its obligation; not when some crisis of danger brought you face to face with the alternatives of an eternal state, though you deemed them solemn and at hand; but when first there stood near you some transparent nature, nobler, simpler, purer than yourself, that fixed your eye, and compelled you to look up. This loving wonder at such impersonated goodness is the sole attraction to which we rise: this it is which sprinkles us with a wave of true regeneration . . . the inward suggestions of conscience remain dreamlike, suspicious, and do not clear the air so long as they play around our own centre . . . and the faith of conscience hovers with us meaningless and incomplete, till it rests upon a realised Righteousness' (ii. 30-3).

The form which belief in God assumes when it is attained by means of the moral nature is different from that which we ascribe to Him when we reach His being by an intellectual exercise. God is the 'supreme term in the hierarchy of spiritual natures.' 'Until we are contradicted, we are carried by our moral nature into conceptions of God which are the transcen-

den nee for min mea of n pass affe as t to k bene mor tions unch chec then mad of H is no Him. earth also 1 rewai sage loves

leads we kn secret human we dis often persor part ir where spring dom o Ha

and f

nor is

the ide righted two vie but to person

VI 104

Oct. 1888

gs of

elopually ry far ience.

from says at he

t that riginal God found feeling

expe-

ication hat for resence of our divine

find its d willing a creed at truth; precept, f danger nal state, irst there urer than p. This attraction e of true in dreamay around with us Righteous-

attained at which tellectual y of spiriied by our transcen-

dent forms of our own aims and prayers' (ii. 42). We must needs ascribe to Him Benevolence towards sentient beings, for this is the character which He has written upon our own minds and upon the general sentient life of creation. It is by means of the affections that He has bound together the races of men, and of the lower animals. And we must read His compassion and love in that of His creation. Whether we regard our affections as the means whereby we come to know Him, or as the effects of His work, we alike feel ourselves constrained to know Him as love. But His nature is not one of simple benevolence. He is Just, and distributes His treatment to moral beings according to their deeds. In us the social affections are not the crown of excellence. When they dominate unchecked within us they render us feeble; but they must be checked and guided by our sense of right and wrong; we infer then that it is so with Him, and that the mind of Him who made us is the prototype of our own. And, lastly, we think of Him as moved by amity towards like minds. So that it is not merely the affections which we regard as reflecting Him, nor conscience in its stern judgments furnishing an earthly image of what He is in His supreme perfection, but also the moral nature in its hours of calm, and in the inward rewards which it gives to well-doing, that speaks to man a message from the source of His being, and telling him that God loves those who are like Him. Saintly people have thought and felt in all ages that they enjoyed communion with God; nor is there any reason to disbelieve them.

These are the attributes of God to which our moral nature leads us in its personal and individual work. So much should we know of God were we quite alone in the world: a 'separate secret for you and me'—'a private understanding between the human spirit and the divine, were they alone together.' But we discover in time that we are not alone. Our conscience is often roused by the influence of other men, and cannot do its personal work in ourselves without at the same time taking part in the great upward movement of the general conscience whereby God is recognized as the head of society, the well spring of all social progress, the founder and ruler of a king-

dom of God.

Having sought and found God in the intellect through the idea of causality, and God in the soul through the idea of righteousness, it remains for Dr. Martineau to identify the two views and show that we are not led to two different beings but to one. And first he shows how we ourselves, in our own persons, unite subjection to physical order with subjection to

the moral law so closely that it is impossible to separate them. Of all the results in the physical world which display causal thought and design the sphere of human life is the most important. Not alone the wonderful structure of the human body, but the play of motives, the connexions of man with man, the linked and ordered whole which man and man's world display to him when he makes himself an object of his own thought, and, sitting apart, watches himself as he lives and moves and has his being. But he cannot long maintain this separate attitude of a speculator upon his own life and its conditions. He must be up and doing; he must not only think but live. And the moment he begins to live he places himself in a different position towards the whole frame of nature and towards its head. In the one case he demands a God to satisfy the demands of his thought, in the other a God to answer the wants of his moral life. But the two are inextricably united; we pass from one to the other in a moment, and the results of our thought furnish materials for our active life, while our active life affords the very scene on which our thought speculates. 'Moral phenomena presuppose physical as their condition . . . our probation as moral consists in managing ourselves as animal, and He that has devised the trial must have created the test. The very Ego to which He offers it is a unity of the natural and spiritual' (ii. 54); and in truth the phenomena of our moral life require a cause, and compel us to characterize that cause as moral.

Conscience busies itself about our conduct in our physical relations. We ourselves are causes in the system of the world; and the question how we have used our causality is the issue which is submitted to our inward judgment. And the laws which work in the outward world are made the instruments of moral punishment and reward. 'The Divine Causality places itself at disposal of the Divine Perfection'

(ii =6)

This assertion admits of no doubt within the sphere of our own lives, and must for ever render it impossible to separate the God who causes all things from the God who teaches us right. Yet it is but too possible to raise the question whether in nature at large the character which He fills in the one aspect does not conflict with that which He presents in the other. And this is the second question of teleology: not whether the universe is such as we should have expected from Infinite Intelligence, but whether it corresponds to Infinite Goodness, and whether life is worth living? Now the universal love of life is a test of its value. Schopenhauer ascribes

th to ex th ca ch liv su an int

to

18

act ha firs the the the As and eve is a be a jo end sad tha per

own and rend and the dreat hint

mit

wor nati life have a m eart whice appe them. the love of life to a blind instinct, and insists that, were you causal to knock at the graves and offer their inhabitants a return to existence, they, delivered as they are from the delusions of st imthis world, would refuse the offer. But this is a test which uman with cannot be applied, and it seems reasonable to say that the choice of all creatures to live implies a sense that life is worth man's This preference is indeed an instinct, but it can be subjected in man to the test of consciousness and reflection, and even then does not lose its power. As long as life offers interests men wish to live; and when these cease they wish to die. And, in general, life abides while its interests are active, and death comes when they are over. The balance of places happiness would seem to be on the side of life. me of ands a

The pains which throw doubt upon this verdict are in the first place those which accompany life in its working, and in the second place those which accompany its dissolution. Of the first it is to be said that they 'work the organism;' it is the constant desire to avoid them that secures human activity. As the pessimist states the case, indeed, life is but a constant and always ineffectual attempt at escape from pain, which ever renews itself in the very moment of pleasure. But there is a more cheerful way of looking at the same fact. Life may be regarded as a constant triumph over suffering by energya joy of victory as well as of fruition. But the pains which end the organism, instead of urging it on to its work, are of a sadder character. We cannot explain them. We can but say that it is not possible for us to separate the possibility of imperfection from the existence of a sentient world. Once committed to a determinate method, God's will is limited by His own acts, and we have no right to argue as if it were unpledged and free, 'a system of laws which in providing for the occurrence of one set of phenomena relinquishes the conditions of another' (ii. 85). Death is a necessary part of the plan, and the support of life requires that death shall be painful and dreaded.

Sometimes we can see even in the worst calamities some hint of the connexion which they have with the plan of the world that suffices to point out to us which way the explanation lies. The convulsions of nature which destroy human life almost on as large a scale as the cruelties of man himself have their origin in this, that a physical order coexists with These disturbances belong to the story of the a moral. earth; they are 'remnants of the process of planet-making' which is still in progress, and the question is whether the appearance of life on the earth ought to have been postponed

of his lives intain and its t only a God e inexoment, active

ch our

hysical

ists in

sed the

ich He

Oct.

); and se, and hysical of the ality is . And ade the Divine

fection '

e of our eparate ches us whether the one s in the y: not ed from Infinite the uniascribes until the earth was so ready to receive it that no possibility of injury to it from the unstable condition of its dwelling-place should be possible. Or is the preponderance of happiness so great even now that God is justified by the general suffrage as not having begun our life in a wholly ill-prepared lodging, even though an occasional disturbance proclaims that it is not

yet quite in order?

There is no feature of the system of nature which repels us more than the predaceous habits of many animals. It is this, even more than the convulsions of the inanimate world, that presents nature to us as 'red in tooth and claw.' Dr. Martineau acknowledges that he cannot always free himself from these impressions; yet they arise from partial views. It is a complete exaggeration to represent animated nature as engaged in a general war. No tribe of animals selects its prey from more than a few species. The creatures that are most savage when roused by hunger are gentle and affectionate to their own kindred; and the suddenness of attack which shocks the observer is in reality a mercy to the victim and to its companions: 'the herd of deer that loses a victim to the pursuing panther turns in its flight into some fresh pasture and grazes and forgets.' Let the critic of the predaceous system balance against it the alternative that must take its place. difficulty out of many will enable us to grasp the vastness of the problem. What would you do with the bodies of dead animals? The carnivora, including man himself, now dispose of the bodies of the slain and spare the trouble of interment. 'Nature has appointed a sanitary commission and, in her carrion-feeders, a burial board far more effective than those which watch over our villages and cities; and one of the great difficulties of our crowded civilisation is due to the fact that there is nobody to eat us' (ii. 95). Were there no carnivora every stream would be poisoned and every plain would resemble a recent battle-field. But then, it may be said, there might be an alteration in the laws of putrefaction. But then we find ourselves carried forward to a total reform of the chemical laws of the universe. The more we reflect the better we see that the blemish which offends us is interwoven with the pattern of the whole, and that its removal must entail consequences so immeasurable that it far passes our powers to say whether they would be for the better.

The additional load of suffering which we men have to bear beyond the lower creatures is the result of our additional capacities. And should we be willing to resign our memory of the past and our anticipation of the future because we she fro pay is in ablanta market only market in (ii. pro

om

the

who

eas

foll

188

acu evil phy tran othe hav no i min crea cons and min cess stro thei and to th awfi capa first him pred they

away

Tho

appe

Oct.

lity

lace

S SO

age

ing,

not

pels

It is

orld.

Iar-

rom

is a

en-

prey

nost

te to

should be thereby freed from the pain which comes to us from both quarters? We should not do so even if we had to pay for our loftiness of nature by unmitigated pain. But this is not so. The intellect which multiplies our troubles by enabling us to foresee and to remember them brings us also numberless joys to which the brutes are strangers. And our moral nature finds its occasions in suffering without which there could not be pity, sympathy, or self-devotion. And not only its occasions but also its discipline. 'Ease and prosperity may supply a sufficient school for the respectable commoners in character; but without suffering is no man ennobled' (ii. 101). 'This characteristic pain is the very spring of all progressive good, and justifies the ancient aphorism, "Dei omnia laboribus et doloribus vendunt." If you ask me why they are not given gratis I hold my peace, till you show me whether that would have been better for anything but our ease; and whether, in case of such gift, the thanks would have followed' (ii. 105).

And now we face the problem of moral evil. Our author acutely remarks at starting that the complaint which moral evil suggests is of the opposite character to that prompted by physical evil. For in the one case we lament that man is trampled on so inexorably by the laws of the world; in the other, that so much is left to man's choice when law should have ruled him whether he would or not. But there can be no moral probation without a play of will. It is self-determination that makes the man, and the great school for creating it is the school of difficulty. 'The life according to conscience lifts the human character to its highest altitude, and subjects the whole realm of instinct to the self-determining will; 'while, on the other side, there is a reverse process of a dreadful kind, by which those who yield to the stronger rather than to the worthier impulses, lose gradually their power of self-government; 'the moral life is to all intents and purposes expunged, and the human constitution reverts to the simply zoological '(ii. 113-14). There is thus a provision, awful but conclusive, for stopping the history of sin and incapacitating the agent for indefinitely committing more. The first impulse of the prophets of righteousness when they see him thus is to cry, 'He cannot cease from sin,' and perhaps to predict for him eternal retribution; but looking a little deeper they will rather say, 'He has lost the privilege of sin and sunk away from the rank of persons into the destiny of things." Those who have read the essay on Eternal Retribution which appeared in our last (p. 363) will not fail to perceive that the

comuing azes ance One ss of dead pose nent. her hose the fact carrould there then the etter with entail

ve to tional mory se we

owers

tl

it

0

re

h

he

SC

re

sh

Si

pi

hi

ad

co

th

re

th

an

the

tio

SOI

no

bu

nei

COL

abl

diff

awful moral fact which Dr. Martineau expounds need not be opposed to the doctrine of eternal retribution, but may be used to explain its nature. When the prophet of righteousness in Scripture speaks of those who cannot cease from sin, it is obvious that either he is using the expression 'cannot' in a sense which, though approaching that of absolute incapacity, does not quite attain to it; or, if this be not so, he is using the word 'sin' in the 'material' sense of transgression of the law, not in the 'formal' sense of an action the result of choice. In the latter case, it is the opinion of the preacher of righteousness that probation is past for the miserable people of whom he speaks, and the blackness of darkness to which he looks forward as their fate is not eternal retribution for their present sins but for their past—a mere continuation of that incapacity to cease from sin to which they have already reduced themselves (ii. 115).

Dr. Martineau's treatment of that department of the problem of moral evil which may be classed as 'the triumph of force in history,' presents to us his comprehensive view of the annals of mankind. That 'the weakest goes to the wall' is a mere truism: but if you mean that the physically weak are at the mercy of their inferiors in intellectual and moral power, the proverb only holds true on a small scale and for

a time.

'There are four types of human life: (1) that of instinctive appetite or passion, in which there is the least remove from the condition of other animals; (2) that of self-conscious pursuit of personal or social ends, involving the first exercise of will; (3) that of conscience, in which these ends are taken not as we like but as we ought; (4) that of faith, in which the conflict is transcended between what we like and what we ought, and duty becomes divine' (ii. 119).

And of these four states it may be clearly shown that each is an advance in strength upon the state behind. The life of prudence saves the waste of the life of passion. The moral life adds authority to those maxims of action which had been but intellectually discerned. And when the human instinct and the divine prompting coalesce, the maximum of power which human nature is capable of attaining is secured.

And here, we regret to say, we must conclude our account of this remarkable work. Willingly should we have analyzed with greater completeness the portions on which we have dwelt. We feel that we have been presenting but dry bones of an original which is as full of beauty as of truth. Willingly also should we have gone on to lay before our readers an outline of the two divisions which succeed—in the one of which

Dr. Martineau reviews opposing systems and defends his Theism against Pantheism, and his maintenance of free will against determinism; while in the last book he presents the natural arguments for a life to come with wonderful power. We trust that all theological teachers who use Butler's Analogy with their classes will resort to Dr. Martineau's concluding treatise as the best existing commentary—even if we may not say as a desirable substitute—for Butler's chapter on a future life.

Imperfect, however, as our account of the work has been, we trust that those who are already acquainted with it, and those who may be induced by our recommendation to study. it as it deserves, will confess that we have given a just idea of its positive doctrine, and have omitted no essential element either of the sources or of the contents of religion which the revered teacher has presented to us. And now, retracing with honour and gratitude these successive chapters, each a storehouse of delicate feeling and high thinking, we ask ourselves, have we here indeed a just and complete account of the sources of religion and of its contents? Are the sources of religion complete without Revelation? are the contents of religion completely enumerated without any mention of Worship, or of Prayer, or of Sacrifice, or of the Forgiveness of Sin? These things in one form or another, and in various proportions, have furnished the sources and contents of every historical religion, and can they be dismissed as superfluous additions in a treatise which founds its conceptions upon a consideration of man as he is? It rises upon our lips to say that Dr. Martineau has presented us with an introduction to religion, but not with an account of it; that he has opened the way to its source, but not shown us the spring as it flows; and has pointed us, like another Moses, to the rich contents of the Promised Land without leading us in.

But we do not think that this would be a true representation. Dr. Martineau has shown us not merely where the sources of religion lie, but a certain portion of their course; not merely where we may go to find the contents of religion, but also a rich selection of its contents themselves. But in neither case has he led us far enough, or followed out to their complete consequences the principles which he has so admir-

ably proved.

In the *Types of Ethical Theory* ¹ the author expounds the difference between the Christian view of ethics and all which

in a ity, sing the cher able s to

tion

tion

Oct.

be

sed

the mph w of vall' veak noral for

lition

each ife of noral been

count lyzed have cones ingly

rs an

tinct

XUM

¹ Vol. i. p. 15 (8vo ed.).

Oct.

t

p

tl

W

tl

had preceded it, ascribing to Christianity an absolute monopoly of the psychological treatment of morals.

'In the Christian religion, on the other hand, the interest, the mystery of the world were concentrated in human nature. All the relations between it and God became immediate and direct, not incident to it merely as part of the universal organism, but due to its own special state and essence; so completely that they would remain the same were the visible frame of things to vanish and leave us alone in the Infinite Presence. The sense of sin-a sentiment that left no trace in Athens-involves a consciousness of personal alienation from the Supreme goodness; the aspiration after holiness directs itself to a union of affection and will with the source of all perfection; the agency for transferring men from their old estrangement to new reconciliation, was a Person in which the divine and human historically blended; and the sanctifying spirit by which they are sustained at the height of their purer life is a living link of communion between their mind and the Soul of souls,'

Who could have supposed that the author of this passage, when he came to treat directly of religion, and of religion as connected with ethics, would absolutely pass over Christianity without mention, as though there were nothing in that faith which distinguished it from other so-called religions, or as if the additions which it makes to the natural religion of causality and conscience were unworthy of notice? We do not in the least suspect Dr. Martineau of any such opinion. We suppose that the abruptness, which he confesses, in passing from the third to the fourth book of his present work is due to an omission of a large part of what properly belongs to the design and title of the work. In these missing chapters, did we happily possess them, we should doubtless meet with something we should disagree with, but also with much which, as in the extract just made, would to our minds point to Catholic Christianity most nobly conceived. Taking the work, however, as we find it, the reader will have gathered, even from our imperfect exposition, that Dr. Martineau displays two great roads which lead from man to God and from God to man. The first is the road of causality, and the second the road of morals. And he then proves that these are not two quite separate ways, but open into one another all along. He first shows us that, in our very first perception of external things, we become acquainted with causation in this waythat we ourselves, actively exerting our living powers in an outward direction, find them answered by a corresponding power acting inwards upon us. And as our own living

¹ Study of Religion, ii. 325.

powers have in them that spontaneity which constitutes a true cause, they are compelled to receive the response to them which comes from outward things as issuing from a true cause too. A man who calls is answered by a sound corresponding to his call; a man who pushes is resisted by a push; and human nature receives from the world without an answer of a like kind to its initiative. Perception in every smallest instance exemplifies this fact; but enlarging experience pushes back the causal source of our perceptions until it finds it in the one God, author and life of the universe.

This is the first and surest truth of human life.

But the history of thought displays the danger under which we lie of exaggerating our own share in this great exchange. The initiation is ours. We open the door, and every object of perception as it enters must assume the costume of our We have seen how some metaphysicians have been led hereby to an extravagant egoism, and how their error has been corrected by successors, who have shown that man, in the exercise of his powers, can but regard himself as subordinate to a vaster Mind, which endows him with his faculties and with his freedom to use them, and at the same time supplies them with their necessary aliment from without. The error and the correction are not merely speculative but practical. We are constantly tempted to consider ourselves as possessed of creative powers with respect to the outward world and with respect to God, whom we discern behind it; whereas the truth is that the thrust from without is infinitely stronger than the thrust from within, to which it replies. We who feel are puny beings in comparison to the greatness of that which is felt, and of Him who makes it to be felt. Not only must we learn that the field of knowledge is infinite in comparison to our powers to know, but even those powers themselves must be recognized as but a subordinate instance of the living energy which works around us as far as thought can reach.

Therefore, when we realize God as cause, and, in the true sense of the term, the only cause, we must not think of the great discovery as one which we have found out, but as one which has found us out. We must lose the thought of our own causality in that of the infinite causality of God. And the causality of God is absolute, not (as Dr. Martineau somewhere explains) in the sense of being unconnected with any limited instances, but in the sense of being inclusive of every instance. We must regard Him as selecting the knowledge which He presents to us, the particular import and effect of

the inits ain us hat na-

ct.

0-

he

hissusion

n;

age,
a as
aity
aith
s if
of
do
ion.
sing
due
s to
ters,
with

oint the ered, disfrom

two He ernal

n an ding iving it on us, the less and the more of it; all its characteristics are from Him, and by necessary consequence they characterize Him. Accordingly, Dr. Martineau has truly taught us to find God's attributes in His causation. Now, this is Revelation in all the essential meaning of the word. The difficulty which we find in accepting the idea of Revelation is, first, that of seeing God in some events more than in others, although He is the source of all; and second, that of regarding God as imparting the knowledge of Himself to us, rather than ourselves as acquiring the knowledge. And both these Dr. Martineau leads us to overcome. He guides us to make a selection of some phenomena as characterising God better than others, and feel that in doing so we are following the selection which God Himself has made and set before us to

observe: Himself the teacher, we the learners.

The second road by which Dr. Martineau guides us to God is that of morals. He shows us that our moral nature leads us of necessity to a divine source. He proves that his belief is not at all inconsistent with the recognition of progress and development in morals or with the importance of social influences. But history and society are not the originators of our moral feelings. They are the instruments of promoting in us the exercise of a spiritual faculty which has its connexions beyond the world; and they are the servants of One who acts through nature but is above it. And here again we find the idea of Revelation—Revelation in history and in the human soul. The moral influence of God upon man is exercised by selected means-by this event more than by that, by this example more than by that, by suggestions which come to us, whether through circumstances which we can trace or through thoughts that come to us we know not how. Anyway, our moral progress depends upon God revealing His will to us. We must not think of ourselves as discovering His will, but of Him as making it known. The belief that we are under God's moral guidance implies the belief that He is not precluded by His absolute nature from connecting Himself with earthly circumstance and with lives which are limited and conditioned. But this again is the essential nature of Revelation: in this consists the difficulty of the idea, and the mighty import of it as the message from God to man, the Word of God.

We come in contact, then, with God as cause in the experiences of our earthly lives, with God as the teacher and judge in the movements of our conscience. And in both departments separately, and still more in the union of the fr w ti th ca th te

ve

g

in all at Bi ar M rig

its

giv

tai wh cha the thi

plie the rea two tion not evice the only

by who Els

VIIM

two, we learn the character and attributes of God. reasoner who has proved this to us has thrown the doors wide open to Revealed Religion: he has taught a revealed religion. The advanced guard of Christianity has entered under his guidance, and there is no impediment of any kind different from those which he has cleared away, to the entrance of the There are indeed difficulties, and vast difficulwhole army. ties, in the acceptance of Christianity. It is hard to believe that God has come to man, a creature of short life and small capacity, the inhabitant of a planet no way remarkable among the myriads of the universe. It is hard to believe that the teaching of God to the human soul should partake so much more of its imperfection than of His perfection, as to be conveved in historical events and human writings, subject to all the imperfections in form and all the risks of forgetfulness, and all the mistakes, doubts, and disputations which necessarily attach to earthly events and to books committed to man. But whatever difficulty, whether in the general conception of a revelation or in the details of its conveyance to men, may arise from this source, has been faced and overcome by Dr. Martineau in the proof that causation, as men experience it, and right as men know it, comes to them from God. We do not, to be sure, mean that Christianity is to be accepted without its own warrant beyond and besides that which has been given of God's power and of His righteousness; we but maintain that the evidence of Christianity and the dispositions which it demands for acceptance of it are of a precisely similar character with those which are required for the acceptance and the use of theism as a real faith and a religion for man. this is often forgotten.

The readers of Robert Elsmere, reviewed in our last number, will remember that his religious change is effected by two agents, Mr. Gray and Mr. Wendover, one of whom supplies the positive system which is to fill for him the place of the religion which he rejects, while the other furnishes the reasons for its rejection. The division of labour between the two is complete. The one knows nothing of religious negation and the other nothing of religious affirmation; the one nothing of evidence, and the other nothing of belief without evidence; the one is full of moral earnestness and sympathy, the other is pure intellect, without pity, without devotion, only induced to perform a plain obligation to his dependents by the necessity of furnishing a quid pro quo to the proselyte who has yielded up to him his Christian faith. And when Elsmere has adopted his new creed his argument for it is that,

Dr. a ter the to to ure

his

ct.

CS

IC-

us

re-

ty

at

gh

as

ır-

oroe of
gins of
has
ants
here
tory
pon
han
ions
we
not

not res as The the from lives s the culty

e exand both f the

from

while it may be made perfectly clear to capable minds that Christianity is a human product, theism never can be disproved. 'By no advance of science can it be driven out of the field.' The new creed depends not on evidence, but on its noble effects, on the glory which it spreads over man's existence and the despair which it shuts out, on the divine sanction which it gives to the best things in human life; for its God is 'the force at the root of things which is revealed to us whenever a man helps his neighbour or a mother denies herself for her child.' But the old creed we are to believe is in a totally different position. 'Its grounds are not philosophical, but literary and historical; it rests not upon all

facts, but upon a special group of facts.'

We totally deny the distinction, and we call upon all truthful thinkers to recognize that we are right. It is absolutely untrue that the human origin of genuine Christianity can be made clear to capable minds, and equally untrue that by no conceivable advance of science could theism such as Elsmere holds be driven out of the field. revealed to us when a man helps his neighbour must be, if the words are to mean anything, a special force, a force with a character, a force 'revealed' and recognized by selected facts. Not only might an advance of science be conceived which would drive the belief in such a force out of the field, but such an advance has been already made to the satisfaction of multitudes of men of science. Ask Mr. Herbert Spencer whether he believes in a special force at the root of things, as distinguished from the general force, in a force with a character, revealed in human self-denial, but not in human cruelty. He will reply that our licence to ascribe a character to the force at the root of things is absolutely disproved by science. But even if the verdict of science be otherwise read, the existence of such a force is matter of evidence. It may be prepared for by philosophy, but in itself it is matter, not of philosophy, but of history and of fact; that is to say, of special facts, groups of facts, selected out of the indiscriminate mass of phenomena for their significance and the power of their appeal. It depends on evidence, and if the nobleness of its tendencies and its agreement with philosophy are to be allowed into the question, that can only be because such considerations are demands which God and nature make of us in the reception of any evidence upon moral subjects.

When you come to Christianity the case is just the same. Philosophy prepares for it. If there were anything in the nature of man's mind and his relation to the world and God

ha pro his wh we acc rea jus of wh you mo Chi to to exe den can to th spiri pries have of J War see (saw we d War seen life a

18

wh

He pus for reason one pus ha

make

foundabecom falseho of givi up me faith, a

VOI

Oct.

hat

lis-

of

on

an's

rine

for

aled

nies

re is

ilo-

all

all

bso-

nity

true

such

force

be, if

with

ected

eived

field,

ction

encer gs, as

cha-

uelty.

o the

ience.

existpared

ophy,

facts,

f phe-

ppeal.

encies to the

ns are

eption

same.

in the

d God

which made such a religion impossible; if miracles do not happen, or if the assertion that they do not happen were proof that they did not happen; if a calm view of man and his state bore no testimony to the existence of the wants which Christianity supplies, and its capacity to supply them, we could not accept it. Neither, on the other hand, can we accept it any more than theism upon mere philosophical reasons. It also is a question of fact and history. But it is justly required that we should come to consider the evidence of this history with that conscious need of a positive religion which the theist so plainly appeals to. On what ground will you make Roger Wendover, the man without aspirations or moral craving, the judge par excellence of the evidence of Christianity, when you submit the evidence of theism only to your Grays and Elsmeres, men of deeply spiritual nature, to whom religion and real religion is a necessity? You exempt them from the necessity of offering to Wendover evidence of their faith such as can pass his tests. How then can you justly require of the Christian to submit his faith to the criticism of the bare intellect, without any demand of spirit, of feeling, or of faith? It is not a blind superstitious priest here and there, but millions of men and women, who have found it easier to discern God in the works and words of Jesus than in humanity at large. We know what Mrs. Ward's reply to this would be: that Elsmere teaches men to see God in Jesus just as the people among whom he worked saw God in Elsmere. But even in this sense of seeing God, we do not know how to see Him in Jesus, regarded as Mrs. Ward regards Him. Nor would Elsmere's adherents have seen God in him if such corrections of the central ideas of his life and teaching had to be made by believers in him as he makes in Jesus.

Dr. Martineau is not to be accused of any such unfairness. He presents his theism on the basis of facts, and he prepares us for the reception of these facts by a genuine philosophy reasoned, not assumed. We do not remember more than one passage of his work which looks in the direction which we have described.

'The Theocratic conception of society rests upon indestructible foundations in our nature, and must for ever return, unless that nature becomes atheistic. The mischiefs it has occasioned are due, not to falsehood in its principle, but to defects in its application. Instead of giving us too much that is Divine, it has given us too little, setting up mere exclusive pretensions for an order of men, or for a particular faith, and waging war on all else as if it were profane, and failing to

VOL. XXVII.-NO. LIII.

10

recognize the sacred possibilities involved in the remaining elements of life and other forms of religion' (ii. 50).

It is indeed too true that this narrow spirit has been displayed, but it is no essential element in the most orthodox Christianity. The sacred possibilities involved in the remaining elements of life and other forms of religion may as reasonably be regarded in the light of preparations and witnesses for the supreme excellence of Christianity as taken for its contrasts and its foils. And for our part we not only prefer the former aspect, but admit that we can hardly hope to maintain Christianity at the present day in any other character than that of the Divine completion of all for which man without religion, or by the aid of inferior religions, has longed and striven. But as to the exclusive pretensions of an order of men, or of a particular faith, we cannot sanction any absolute condemnation of them, because we fear the condemnation might be so understood as to dissipate and nullify all that distinctness of belief which, under the guidance of Dr. Martineau himself, we have humbly and patiently striven to acquire. Pretensions of men depending on human pride and passion are contemptible, and so far as the word 'pretensions' may be thought to imply such an origin, we willingly renounce it. But if we must disclaim all consciousness, however humble and truthful, of the possession of a treasure of faith which those who have not learnt in the same school are without, how shall we maintain that Dr. Martineau's own teaching is true, or that it is any spiritual benefit to hold with him? Nor can we understand how any faith which is real can be other than a particular faith. Let us make our faith as comprehensive as we can, but it cannot be entirely general unless we regard it as the physical endowment of all men, whatever their belief and whatever their morals. And if it be this, to what purpose should we write books on religion or read them?

For ourselves, therefore, we profess that the revelation of God which Dr. Martineau (eternal gratitude to him for the service) teaches us to believe in, excites in us the desire and the hope of further words from God beyond those which come to us in nature and conscience; words still more helpful to deliver us from the evil that is in the world and in ourselves, still more effectual to fill our lives with the consciousness of His union with us, and with loving service of Him and of mankind for His sake; and we maintain that we find what we desire and hope in Jesus Christ, and in Him alone.

2

at

th

m br de wl tur

gra

Th

wh

a r

phi

frie ma
Dr.
Em
an
app
met
with
reac
Gre
tags
tice
duce

exag Ralp (Mas minis Conc minis

Eme

VIIM

ART. III.—RALPH WALDO EMERSON.

I. A Memoir of Ralph Waldo Emerson. By J. E. CABOT. 2 vols. (London, 1887.)

2. Life of Richard Waldo Emerson. By RICHARD GARNETT, LL.D. 'Great Writers.' (London, 1888.)

A YANKEE mystic implies a human impossibility, and Transatlantic Transcendentalism a contradiction in terms. the first is, or was, a real being, and the second exercised a very definite influence. Emerson is far more than a mere mystic, and the movement which he inspired and directed broadened out beyond its local phase of Bostonian Transcendentalism. But his name suggests topics connected with both, which, to judge from the recent growth of Emersonian litera-

ture, appear full of interest at the present day.

Mr. Cabot and Dr. Garnett are Emerson's latest biographers, and their treatment of the subject is widely different. The former supplies many details of a full-length portrait which he supposes already to exist in outline; the latter paints a miniature for those to whom the figure and features of the philosopher were previously unknown. To Emerson's familiar friends Mr. Cabot's volumes are indispensable from the new material which they contain, but strangers will derive from Dr. Garnett's compact little work the most complete idea of Emerson's life, character, and writings. The one writes for an American, the other for an English, audience. But the appearance of Dr. Garnett's Life enables us to pursue the method of Mr. Cabot, and to presuppose some acquaintance with the outlines of Emerson's career on the part of our Our only quarrel with this excellent addition to the 'Great Writers' series is the frequent introduction of Scriptural The first thirty pages afford five illustrations of a practice which, viewed simply as a question of prose style, produces the effect of tawdriness.

Emerson's life was marked by few events, and Mr. Cabot exaggerates its tranquillity by a biography without facts. Ralph Waldo Emerson was born in 1803; he died at Concord (Mass.) in 1882. His forefathers for six generations had been ministers. His grandfather built the famous Old Manse at Concord, where Hawthorne afterwards lived. His father was minister of a Unitarian church at Boston, and in that city Emerson was born. His character and writings are redolent

lisox inon-

ct.

nts

ses its efer to

haiich has s of tion con-

llify Dr. n to and

ions' unce mble hich hout,

ng is Nor other npreinless

teve: nis, to hem? ion of or the

e and come oful to selves, ness of

and of what

t

th

ef

P

th

in

E

ha

m

CO

hi

thi

alv

the

his

me

ph

tha

vie

to

the

ou

the

inc

the

pai

app

alw

ins

do

wh

lect

Em

con

inte

OWI

gui

app

of his nation and his ancestry. In all the details of his teaching he is the quintessence of shrewdness: he deals with the means of life like a keen man of the world; in the application of his philosophy to everyday duties he is common sense personified. His mystical tendencies are modernized and modified by his industrial surroundings, and his pantheism is checked and controlled by his vehement assertion of individuality. He writes like a man who has been bred in a creed which does not satisfy his heart and intellect, and who is driven by the materialism of the Unitarian tenets, with all the force of recoil and reaction, into ideal spiritualism. Yet he preserves in his teaching the Puritan fervour, and, although he hates its gloom, displays something of its austere tenacity: he believes in absolute morality and fixed ethical standards; he condemns artistic apathy, and enforces a stern practical rectitude in the working world. He has the Puritan's depth of religious feeling without his self-will, and the tastes of the Cavalier without his dissoluteness. His temperament is Greek in its eager love of beauty, while with an Eastern's self-abandonment he soars into the heights of ecstatic idealism. Thus he combines the Pagan and the Hebrew, the Cavalier and the Puritan, the Neo-Platonist and the industrial utilitarian, the poet and the merchant, the passivity of the mystic with the activity of the man of affairs. He has been called a 'Plotinus-Montaigne,' and Mr. Lowell (Fable for Critics) credits him with-

'A Greek head on right Yankee shoulders, whose range Has Olympus for one pole, for th' other the Exchange.'

It is the combination of these various elements which makes his position and his influence an interesting study.

Like Carlyle, Emerson was designed for the ministry. He did, in fact, receive Unitarian orders, and from 1829 to 1832 was minister of a Unitarian church at Boston. In the latter year he resigned his pastorate, because he regarded the Sacrament as a merely commemorative rite. But up till 1839 he preached frequently, and to the end of his life constantly attended church. He came three times to England. In 1833 he crossed the Atlantic, partly in search of health, partly to see the men who had most influenced his own mind—Landor, Coleridge, Wordsworth, and Carlyle. He visited England in 1847 as a lecturer, and published his impressions of 'English traits' in a volume which is full of quick-witted observation. His third visit, entirely of a private character, was paid in 1873, during the rebuilding of his house, which had been destroyed by fire.

his

with

opli-

mon

ized

eism

indi-

reed

o is

1 the

t he

ough

city;

rds;

ctical

lepth

f the

reek

ban-

Thus

d the

, the

1 the

inus-

him

nakes

. He

1832

latter

Sacra-

39 he

tantly

1833

His influence in America can scarcely be exaggerated. Mr. Lowell writes of him in My Study Windows in relation to Carlyle:

'Both represented the old battle against Philistinism. It was again, as in the times of Erasmus, of Lessing, of Wordsworth, a struggle for fresh air, in which, if the windows could not be opened, there was danger that panes would be broken, though painted with effigies of saints and martyrs. When Emerson wrote, New England Puritanism, as a motive of spiritual progress, was dead, and in him, the herald of its formal decease, it found a new avatar. The Puritan revolt had made us ecclesiastically, and the Revolution politically, independent, but we were still socially and intellectually moored to English thought till Emerson cut the cable, and gave us a chance at the dangers and glories of blue water. No man young enough to have felt it can forget or cease to be grateful for the mental and moral nudge which he received from the writings of his brave-spirited countryman. That we agree with him, or that he always agrees with himself, is aside from the question. But that he arouses in us something that we are the better of having awakened, that he speaks always to what is highest and least selfish in us, few Americans of the generation younger than his own will be disposed to deny.'

His countrymen will remember him for the influence of his free spirit, and for the stimulus which he imparted to mental activity long after they have forgotten his so-called philosophy. A champion of intellectual freedom, he believed that the future of American thought was marred by subservience to foreign models, and American religion by deference to human ordinances. His words braced both the will and the understanding. He gave his countrymen a lift above the outward world, enlarged and elevated their views of life, set them thinking for themselves, urged them to assert their independence in the world of thought. His oration before the Phi-Beta-Kappa Society at Cambridge, in 1838, is compared by Mr. Lowell to a lecture by Abélard or the last public appearance of Fichte. He says that it was 'an event to be always treasured in the memory for its picturesqueness and inspiration. What crowded and breathless aisles, what windows clustered with eager heads, what enthusiasm of approval, what grim silence of foregone dissent!' This once famous lecture on the American scholar sums up a large portion of Emerson's subsequent teaching. The education of the scholar consists in the past, action, life, and, above all, Nature as interpreted by the mind; his office is to inspire men with his own patience, self-denial, and love of truth, to elevate and guide the world to a knowledge of the facts that lie beneath appearances; his duties may be briefly comprehended in the

tly to andor, and in nglish ration. aid in been

XUM

n

d

îı

h

th

de

H

A

H

to

th

cl

lit

he

je

tu

G

So

bu

ho

one word, self-reliance. There is now nothing new in the teaching, but Emerson was hailed as a prophet fifty years ago, because he expressed in brief, strong words thoughts which America had failed to articulate. He was, in fact, the mouth-

piece of the national mind.

In his Lyceum lectures, which proved in his hands powerful educational agencies, and in all his books, he preached this doctrine of self-reliance. It is the very core of his teaching. enforced with a rich variety of illustration in all his public utterances, whether written or spoken. His long life was devoted to reading, thinking, lecturing, and writing. But he was the most fastidious among modern men of letters. He patiently and diligently revised his style, erased, corrected, emended—always intent on compression and concentration. So parsimonious is he of words that he becomes obscure by eliminating the links of his thought. As with his style so with his matter. No man was more impressed with the responsibility of giving birth to a book. He tolerated no excuses for its existence, except that it presented fresh thought or contributed to the general stock of knowledge. He struck out all that was ephemeral, and retained only what he believed to be of abiding interest. Consequently his sentences are literally crammed with thought, and his pages laden with weighty matter. As another result his publications are comparatively few. The following are the names of his most important works with the dates of their appearance:-Nature, 1836; Collected Essays, 1st series, 1841, 2nd series, 1844; Poems, 1846; Representative Men, 1850; English Traits, 1856; Conduct of Life, 1860; May-Day and other Poems, 1867; Society and Solitude, 1870; Letters and Social Aims, 1875. In these books are published whatever Emerson himself thought worthy of preservation. The Riverside edition of his works, printed in 1883, contains a large number of additional pieces, many of which possess permanent interest. But Emerson's vision, though keen, is limited; his sympathies are rather high than broad; his teaching is concentrated on a few primary ethical truths. The substance of his doctrine is soon learned: wider study of all his works calls into prominence his mannerisms and repetitions; it displays wealth of illustration and power of presenting the same subject in different lights, but it does not reveal any variety in the lessons he enforces.

One of Emerson's charms as a writer is his felicity of quotation. 'Noscitur ex sociis.' Literary men are known by their favourite authors. Emerson's pet books may help to

MUX

give a general impression of the character of his own writing. He rarely quotes from Aristotle. Plato is the torch-bearer of his philosophy, and he cites him more frequently than any other writer except Shakespeare and Napoleon. Yet he charges Plato with the same want of system of which he is himself rightly accused; he also condemns him for a lack of vital power, which he attributes to his intellectual and literary form. Homer he quotes frequently, but the classic dramatists rarely, if ever. It may be mentioned that Emerson was not a scholar, and that he read and admired Plato in the version of Mr. Bohn. He was, so far as knowledge then extended, well read in Oriental literature, though here again through the medium of translations. He quotes from Saadi and Hafiz; his difficult poem 'Brahma' is an epitome of the Bhagavat-Gita; in his essay on Plato he gives the Oriental view of 'pure being'; in 'Uriel,' a poem based on Arabian and Persian poetry, he discusses the origin of evil, and develops the doctrine of Return:

'Line in nature is not found;
Unit and universe are round:
In vain produced all rays return;
Evil will bless, and ice will burn.'

Like Coleridge he delighted in the mystics, and probably found that they 'kept alive,' as Coleridge wrote, 'the heart within the head,' and 'were a pillar of fire throughout the night, during my wanderings through the wilderness of Plotinus exercised over him a powerful fascination. His own theory of Identity is the ἕνωσις of the Neo-Platonist. Among his favourite authors were Eckart, Tauler, Behmen, Henry More, Roger Cudworth, and George Fox. The latter, together with Swedenborg, greatly influenced his mind at the crisis of his leaving his church in Boston. But though he classed the encyclopædic Swede among the mastodons of literature, and even among the five great poets of the world, he denied his claim to any special revelation with all the jealousy of a democrat. He was well read in English literature, and was especially conversant with Shakespeare, the Elizabethan dramatists, Milton, Bacon, Newton, Swift, and George Herbert. German philosophers, like Kant, Jacobi, Schelling, Fichte, Richter, helped him towards his idealism, but it is difficult to say how far the influence was direct, or how far it operated through their French expositors. Among writers of his own day, Goethe was perhaps the greatest power. But, with his vehement assertion of personal liberty, he repudiated Goethe's theory of individual perfection through

ver-

Oct.

the

igo,

nich

ing, blic was he He ted,

e by the l no resh dge.

aden
s are
most
e:—
eries,
glish

sen-

other Social erson rside numnent

; his conce of works s; it

g the

any

ty of vn by elp to

XUM

d

social union. It has already been said that he visited Europe in 1833 to see four celebrated English writers. Wordsworth's religion of Nature differed essentially from that which he himself professed; he despised Coleridge's attempt to interpret an external written revelation by means of the divine illumination, for, like Schelling, he relied upon infallible intuition alone. Landor and Carlyle influenced rather the form than the substance of his teaching; yet it is difficult not to see, in the dignity of labour so strongly enforced in *The American Scholar*, some more direct trace of Carlyle's teaching.

There remain two special favourites of Emerson—Plutarch and Montaigne. Every nation has admitted Plutarch among its citizens, and is grateful to Jacques Amyot, Bishop of Auxerre, to whom the sixteenth century owed its first knowledge of the historian. It was from 'James Amiot, Abbot of Bellozane, Bishop of Auxerre,' that 'Sir Thomas North, Knight,' made his translation of the Lives which supplied Shakespeare with Coriolanus, Julius Cæsar, and Antony and Cleopatra. An inveterate collector of table-talk and ana, Plutarch displays that good-natured egotism which is the common element in the family of Pepyses and Boswells. He was a Neo-Platonist, and resembled Emerson in his sincerity, his constant cheerfulness of temper, his unswerving belief in the ultimate triumph of good over evil. Like Emerson, too, he is a didactic biographer rather than historian. It is remarkable that Clough, who was an ardent admirer of Emerson, should have published a revised version of Dryden's translation. Plutarch is, through Montaigne, the father of all essayists. Montaigne 'drew from him like the Danaides, filling and emptying sans cesse.' The sceptical philosopher is thus the connecting link between the Greek and the American. The fascination which Montaigne exercised over Emerson is easy to explain; and Sterling, another of Emerson's English disciples, made a pilgrimage to the home of their mutual teacher. Montaigne's essays are transcripts of his mind: 'Ce ne sont mes gestes que j'escris ; c'est mon essence.' Emerson speaks of Montaigne's 'gross semi-savage indecency' as counterbalanced by 'his downright truth without fear or favour.' The quality of sincerity, which Emerson valued so highly in Montaigne, eminently characterizes his own work. it wholly fanciful to trace in the gentilhomme Périgourdin, writing in the library high up in the turret of his Gascon château, some other points in common with the philosopher of Concord. Like Emerson, he was a student and lover of Plutarch. Like Emerson, again, he played the same part, unconsciously

assuming the rôle which Emerson adopted of set purpose. The literature of his day was fashionable, modish, conventional; it was the offspring of the salon and of artificiality. Montaigne is a vox clamantis in deserto, a fearless spirit, careless of criticism, hardy, independent, original. Emerson, from his retirement, protests against deference to unnatural models which had no meaning for his fellowcountrymen. Like Emerson, again, Montaigne was not a man whose solitary musings degenerated into melancholy mania; solitude and society, reverie and action, are the blended flavour of his essays. Thus it was that Montaigne. like Emerson, was respected during the Civil Wars as a man of sound discretion and evenly balanced judgment. On the other hand, Emerson is totally devoid of Montaigne's epicurean indifferentism. Both men are fearlessly honest and transparently egotistical; both know the limits of their knowledge, but Montaigne asked his 'Que sçais-je?' with the gay carelessness of a Frenchman, Emerson with something of the Teuton's discontent.

From the list of Emerson's favourite writers some clue may be derived as to the character of his own works. Platonist rather than an Aristotelian, an idealist not a sensationalist, he grafts upon his philosophy the ecstasy of the Neo-Platonist, the passivity of the Oriental, and the intuition of the German. A vehement champion of individual liberty, he is not concerned to frame a system which shall fetter his own or another's intellectual freedom. A Catholic eclectic, he is less anxious to supply than to suggest the materials of philosophy. At once Pyrrhonist and dogmatist, he doubts everything except the intuitions on which he relies without fear or question. These he announces as oracles which he is content to affirm and disdains to prove. Transparently sincere, he desires only to express truly his passing thoughts, and he cares as little for inconsistencies and contradictions as for system or logic.

These characteristics do in fact reappear in almost every page of his didactic writings. He is an essayist who in brilliancy may be compared with Hazlitt, a moralist who draws moral distinctions as subtle as those of La Bruyère, a creator of aphorisms who is a formidable rival to Vauvenargues, a critic whose penetrating insight is marred by prejudices and inequality, a poet whose deep thoughts are linked to club-foot rhymes. He is also a metaphysician, philosopher, and moralist. He believes that he has found—for himself at

least-

pret umiition than ee, in rican

Oct.

rope

rth's

him-

tarch mong op of nowot of orth, plied and ana, the He erity, ief in , too,

is re-Emerden's of all s, fillher is erican.

son is nglish acher.

peaks unterivour.' nighly Nor is

urdin, ateau, Conitarch.

iously

'the golden key That opes the palace of Eternity.'

His thought, his philosophy, and his teaching were concentrated upon religion, and it is from this point of view that we propose to consider his wide-spread influence. But it is useless to take him for more than he is worth. His teaching is a sandheap of disconnected atoms, the value of which consists in their independent suggestiveness. System he has none; he starts in one direction only to reappear from the opposite. It is impossible to build upon so shifting and unstable a foundation, and it would be wasted labour if we were to attempt to grapple with a writer who expressly disclaims the sequences of logical reasoning, and relies upon the stimulating effect of his isolated thoughts. He transmutes morality into a species of religion by the fire of his enthusiasm for personal purity and rectitude of conduct; but he knew little of religion, if we use the word in the meaning of a deep sense of our relations to a Personal God. His chief negations of orthodoxy, like his failure to construct a system, resulted from his mental limitations. He despised historical Christianity because he was alike indifferent and incompetent to test the value of He repudiated Scriptural inspiration because, consistently with his democratic creed and his doctrine of self-reliance, he enthroned intuition in the seat of reason, and claimed for every man a continuous revelation.

Emerson's philosophy embraces two fields—existence itself and the conduct of life, the infinite and the finite, the abstract and the concrete. It is in the latter field of details and practical application that he shows himself the strongest. In the former he is not only vague and misty, but inconsistent and inconsequential. At one time he sinks God and Nature in Man, and becomes an Idealist; at another he loses God and Man in Nature, and becomes a Materialist; at a third he merges Man and Nature in God, and becomes a Pantheist. Thus he doubts whether Nature is more than an apocalypse of the human mind, and believes that we ourselves produce all her forms. If we could discover the point of contact between our thoughts and outward nature, we might, by a modification of ourselves, transform the world into all that we desire. In his poetry he says:

'The great world goeth
To thy dreaming.
To thee alone
Hearts are making their moan,
Eyes are streaming.

ti

h

tl

ai

PI H

ke

bo

Thine is the white moon turning night to day,
Thine is the dark wood sleeping in her ray;
Thee the winter chills;
Thee the springtime thrills;
All things nod to thee—
All things come to see
If thou art dreaming on;
If thy dream should break,
And thou should'st awake,
All would be gone.'

At another time he makes man the slave of time and space, the prisoner of the outer world—his soul a function of the universe, his life moulded by Nature's informing grace:

'Dost thou dream that thou art free,
Making, destroying, all that thou dost see,
In the unfettered might of thy soul's liberty?
Lo! an atom crushes thee,
One nerve tortures and maddens thee,
One drop of blood is death to thee.
The mighty voice of Nature
Is thy parent, not thy creature,
Is no pupil but thy teacher;
And the world would still move on
Were thy soul for ever flown.'

Emerson is a philosophical Proteus, who refuses to be confined to any single shape. Yet though isolated passages might be quoted which only prove his inconsistency, the principles which really dominate his philosophical musings are those of ideal Pantheism. He accepts that Idealism which says that God is one of Man's ideas, and thus loses God in Man. But generally his tendencies are Pantheistic, and he treats both Man and Nature as phenomena of the divine existence. In method he is rather a mystic than an idealist, and he reaches his peculiar vantage-ground by merging Man and Nature in God. Pantheists see nothing but God where atheists see no God. Hence Pantheism is often the saturnalia, the extravaganza of faith, and, startling though it may sound in the presence of Emerson's seeming flippancy, his peculiar views are, as we believe, due rather to the excess, than to the want, of faith.

Emerson's mysticism of method appears to be the peculiar product of the New World and of the American intellect. His mind is subtle and penetrating, not broad or deep; it is keen rather than comprehensive. There was within its narrow bounds no space for the sublime; and this incapacity explains

ng is a sists one; osite.

Oct.

icen-

t we

s the ating into sonal gion, ar re-

ental se he ue of cause, ne of n, and

itself stract actical n the at and ure in d and rd he theist. pse of ace all

cation

e.

XUM

an attitude which in appearance often approximates to irre-Mysticism scarcely submits to be defined. Broad definitions include visionaries, prophets, necromancers, clairvovants, who are not necessarily mystics: narrow definitions exclude many who in truth belong to the goodly company. The German language distinguishes between that sober mysticism which enters into almost all religion and the licence and extravagance of fanatics. The English tongue admits of no such verbal distinctions. But if mysticism cannot be accurately defined, it may be generally described. It has always been more or less theological. In one phase of mysticism man is content to feel, in another he aspires to know, in a third he seeks a sign; he is passive, philosophical, or material - theopathic, theosophic, or theurgic. Roughly speaking, the speculative or theosophic element predominated in the Eastern Church; in the West the speculative and the sentimental were blended. But in all its phases the essence remains the same. The mystic retires into the recesses of his own consciousness, closes the avenues of the senses, and either sinks into, or explores, the abysses of his own being, if haply he may there behold the Infinite Spirit. Mysticism proceeds from a profound sense of the infinite. It is the earnest endeavour to bring the finite into direct communion with the ultimate principle of existence, to get beneath the superficial accretions of our nature, to penetrate the secrets of the universal life-giving process, to stand in the immediate presence of the Soul which pervades and permeates the whole created universe, to become one with the Primordial Power which mixes the atoms and bids them 'march in tune.' In moments of ecstatic reverie the mystic believed he had attained his end-

'When dying in the darkness of God's light,
The soul can pierce these blinding webs of nature,
And float up to the nothing, which is all things—
The ground of being, where self-forgetful silence
Is emptiness—emptiness fulness—fulness God.'

In seeking a knowledge of the absolute, mysticism is a form of idealism. But though it shares the aims, it disdains the methods of the philosopher. And herein lies its broad distinction from dialectical forms of speculation. Mysticism invokes the testimony of consciousness, appeals to faith as an ultimate authority, claims intuitive insight, scorns the slow processes of induction or deduction, prefers emotion to reason, ridicules the attempt to attain by the intellect any knowledge of the infinite, and soars in ecstasy towards its goal:

XUM

15

re

ti fr

h

re

(8

fo

tr

fir

Oct.

irre-

road

lair-

tions

any.

mys-

and

f no

accu-

ways

icism

in a

terial

g, the

stern

were

same.

sness.

or ex-

there

found

ng the

ple of

of our

giving

which

ecome

is and

everie

'The plumed thoughts take travel, and ascend Through the unfathomable purple mansions, Threading the golden fires, and ever climbing As if 'twere homeward winging . . .

The mystic is not content with approximations; he puts forward no tentative doctrines, but confidently announces the truths which he has seen. Generally, though not universally, he withdraws from active life, whether it be into the extravagant fatalism of the Buddhist, the disembodied intellectualism of the Neo-Platonist, or the sainte indifférence of the Quietist. Almost without exception he destroys personality in univer-

sality, and merges man in God.

Though the object of his search is the same as that of the philosopher, the mystic rejects all philosophical methods of making his search. Yet he has a definite psychology. He holds that man enjoys direct communion with the infinite Spirit, and that the soul is at once the channel of God's approach and His inviolable shrine. He believes in an inward sense, an intuitive faculty of spiritual vision, an eye of the soul which beholds the unseen world as the eye of the body beholds the world of sense. Eckart's 'Spark of the Soul' is Kant's Pure Reason, Schelling's Intellectual Vision, Coleridge's Practical Reason, the source of absolute Truth, the organ of

Philosophy and Theology.

Because the mind is introverted its activity is not necessarily suspended. Many mystics were the most intense and persistent of thinkers. It is its purely contemplative side which has depreciated its value in the eyes of the practical world. The mystic starts from the petitio principii that Truth is not the agreement of our perceptions with their external objects, but with the mind itself. Hence he assumes that the seer and the thing seen, the subject and the object, the thing contemplated and that which contemplates, are identical. By reducing the soul to abstract simplicity (Plotinus's ἄπλωσις). by rejecting all individuality, memory, imagination, reason, time and space, by thrusting forth all that separates the object from the subject, by refusing to exercise the gifts which God has given us that we may know Him, we may elevate our minds above the body, the world, and finite consciousness. reduce ourselves to one divine essence, and realize Identity (ξνωσις) with the Infinite Being. In these moments which are the rare rewards of philosophers our intuitions are infallible. for we are merged in that Being who is not only the source of truth, but Absolute Truth itself. This simplification of our finite souls may be achieved by training thought to its subtlest

m is a isdains broad sticism h as an e slow reason, wledge

W

p

Si

tl

ai

in

in

ar

cl

m

do

ne

th

the

int

cal

ass

bu

by

up

WO

civi

tea

exercise, by reducing the body through asceticism, or through the cessation of all activity in beatific torpor.

It would be an injustice to mysticism to omit another means by which its disciples strive to attain knowledge of the Absolute. Speculation, contemplation, mortification, intuition are not the mystic's only means. He also adopts the spiritual or sentimental method. There are mystics who, with rare singleness of purpose, unremitting self-denial, and unceasing watchfulness, strive to attain knowledge of God through His likeness, to purify their hearts that so they may know Him, to dwell in love that thus they might dwell in God. They bear the cross as a daily duty; they deny themselves in order to rise to a higher life.

'Go out, God will go in;
Die thou, and let Him live;
Be not, and let Him be;
Wait, and He'll all things give.'

This principle may, in practice, mean widely different things. One man may regard all matter as evil, and tread his body under foot; another may crucify the natural desires by rigorous asceticism; another may discipline the lusts of the flesh; another may renounce his will in order that he may cease to be a voluntary agent. It is when this spiritual element is associated with the intellectual element, when thought is wedded to sentiment, speculation to experience, that mysticism becomes the romance of religion, the chivalry of faith, and makes rich the life-blood of the world.

This brief and necessarily imperfect sketch of mysticism helps us to understand the mental attitude of Emerson. Mysticism is a form of philosophy, and

> 'Philosophy itself Smacks of the age it lives in, nor is true Save by the apposition of the present.'

In other words, what special circumstances in America fostered the growth of mysticism? It is needless to seek the explanation in the influence of colonies like the Quakers, Behmenists and Schwenkfelders in Pennsylvania, or the Labadists of New Netherlands. Mental and moral conditions explain the growth. Religion itself was torpid, depressed by a sensational philosophy, ceremonial prescriptions, and a frigid formalism from which the spirit had departed. American thought was curious and inquisitive, eager to lift the veil that separates the seen from the unseen, and to pass the dread bounds of the spirit world. Lastly, industrialism made all-absorbing demands on

human energies, and scientific discoveries annihilated not only space but leisure. Thus mysticism gratified the truly religious by its protest against literalism, fascinated the eager by its efforts to transcend the barriers of time and space, and soothed the weak by its promise of inaccessible rest. The understanding was overtasked; utilitarian ethics choked romance; expediency stifled reason. The same conditions have everywhere produced the same results. Plotinus rebelled against the Stoics and the Epicureans; Bernard of Clairvaux took refuge in mysticism from an arid lifeless orthodoxy; Eckart asserted inward religion against despotic externalism; Schelling, Coleridge, and Emerson fought against the dominant philosophy of Locke and Hume, which robbed religion of its life.

Emerson, profoundly impressed through his Puritan ancestry with a sense of the Infinite, eager to escape from the prison-house of the senses, chafing against the dependence of his nation upon foreign models, recoiling from a religion of which the skeleton alone remained, attracted through his philosophical reading by the doctrine of intuitions, was irresistibly drawn towards the mystics. He sympathised with their assertion of the freedom of the soul against ecclesiastical authority, and his sympathy was heightened by democratic impatience of whatever seemed to trench upon his individual independence. He joined in their protest against literalism, and their preference of the spirit to the letter. Like them, he claimed for himself and his nation a right to the same inspiration which belonged to the prophets, and which he believed might be enjoyed by his own age and by every individual. Like them, he ranged himself naturally on the liberal side in dogmatic theology, and combated, not science, but worldli-But he differed from them essentially in such points as the following. He recognized no creed, no ultimate authority which it was the province of his special revelation to interpret; he repudiated the mystical withdrawal from practical life; he protested against their fatalism, and vehemently asserted human individuality; he advocated self-abnegation, but he transferred 'divine love' to no other Being; he seeks to realize a divinity within him, not by self-annihilation, but by self-reliance. His modifications of mysticism are summed up in the effort to adapt it to the requirements of a new world and a new people, to the needs of an industrial civilization and a democratic constitution.

A brief sketch of some of the leading points in Emerson's teaching will illustrate his obligations to the mystics and his

rare sing His Him, They s in

Oct.

ugh

ther

the

tion

tual

ings.
body
brous
lesh;
se to
is asedded
comes
s rich

icism Mys-

stered explanenists of New rowth. philone from curious ne seen e spirit nds on

ir

ti

bu

in

"t

kn

or

the

lig

bre

ou

thr

thr

con

his

true

thro

air. the

intu

of (

Ove

the

freed

glori

by a

door

he an

not l

went

tude.

the d

he sa

modifications of their doctrines. Like all mystics, Emerson retires into the silent recesses of consciousness, that there he may walk with Infinite Being, as did our first parents in the morning of the world. But he does not seek to exclude the conditioned and the sublunary; he prays the aid of the senses in order to interpret the data of his consciousness. The object of his search is not so much to investigate his own being as to obtain guidance in the practical affairs of life. 'As the traveller who has lost his way throws his reins on his horse's neck, and trusts to the instincts of the animal to find his road, so must we do with the divine animal who carries us through the world.' His object is rather practical than speculative. So, too, his method is never purely contemplative. He never suspends intellectual or moral effort, or allows himself to become passively theopathic. He cultivates to their fullest exercise all his mental powers, and trains to their utmost strength the energies of his moral nature. He does not endeavour to still the waters of his soul to such absolute repose that in them the Divinity may mirror Himself. He rather seeks to become the voice through which the Spirit speaks without let or hindrance, and so passes forth into active life to preach and proselytize.

The theory of Identity lies at the back of all his teaching. He believed that the Infinite entered into and absorbed the finite; that by the annihilation of human personality in the divine immensity, man would become nothing and God everything. He began with Plato. Beneath the changeful appearances of the visible, sensible world lies the one, real, universal All that our senses reveal to us is varying and mimetic; it is the wax that bears the impress of the real. By study of these impressions we find the permanent, universal idea of which they are but copies. And thus we rise, tier by tier, and stage by stage, to that great central unity which is the final stage, the last analysis of all things-that Over Soul in the arms of which both man and nature rest. Nature is its symbol, man its incarnation; nature is its inferior, remoter, unconscious manifestation, man its superior, direct, conscious development. And there exists between man and the Over Soul no abysmal gulf, such as Plato fears to cross. Emerson soars over the chasm and identifies man with this Over Soul and Eternal Mind. Thus the end of creation is answered, and its mystery is solved. The moment the human soul awakens to the full perception of virtue, and can truly say, 'Virtue, I am thine,' then the soul and the man whom it inspires become, not Godlike, but God. When once

Oct.

son

he

the

the

nses

oject

g as

the

rse's

road,

ough

ative.

never

If to

ullest

most

not

solute

Spirit

into

ching.

ed the

in the

every-

ppear-

iversal

g and

e real.

it, uni-

ve rise,

unity

s—that

re rest.

its in-

uperior,

etween

to fears

ies man

end of

moment

tue, and

the man

nen once

He

the human mind grasps this supreme idea, it perceives that it is itself only a fable and an illustration of the Eternal Mind; and, as it penetrates into the laws of nature, it learns that the universe itself is informed by the same Eternal Mind. This was the mystery which, as Emerson believed, Jesus Christ beheld with open eye. He saw that God incarnated Himself in man; and, in the ecstasy of sublime emotion, he cried aloud, 'I am divine; through me God acts; through me speaks. I and the Father are one.'

From this theory of Identity sprang his views respecting intuitions, instincts, free-will, his hostility to historical Chris-

tianity, and his doctrine of self-reliance.

The Over Soul is the vast background of our being. Nothing is except the Soul. Keats felt certain of nothing but the holiness of the heart's affections and the truth of the imagination. But Emerson, like Shelley, makes the Soul 'the hierophant of an unapprehended inspiration, the unacknowledged legislator of the world.' The Soul is not an organ, but animates all organs; not a function, but uses all these as if they were hands and feet; not a faculty, but a light; neither intellect nor will, but the master of both. If it breathes through our intellect we call it genius, if through our wills virtue, if through our affections love. If man so throw down the walls of his being that the great Soul breathes through him without let, hindrance, and obstruction, he becomes a revelation, a law, a moral guide to himself. He is his own source of truth, his own rule of conduct; he finds true freedom of the will in utter self-submission. God shines through each pure soul as the sun shines through the liquid Those who most perfectly obey the laws of being enjoy the greatest measure of inspiration. If obedience is perfect, intuition, instinct, reason are infallible, for they are the voice of God. The more completely we harmonize our lives to the Over Soul, the more we abandon ourselves to its revelation. the deeper will be our spiritual insight, the greater our spiritual freedom, the truer our spiritual independence, the more glorious our spiritual liberty. We may illustrate the point by an Eastern apologue. One knocked at the Beloved's door, and a voice from within asked, 'Who is there?' And he answered, 'It is I.' Then the voice said, 'This house will not hold me and thee.' And the door was not opened. Then went the lover into the desert, and fasted, and prayed in solitude. And after a year he returned, and knocked again at the door. And again the voice asked, 'Who is there?' he said, 'It is Thyself!' And the door was opened.

VOL. XXVII.-NO. LIII,

fa

hi

ob

th

wł

cei

no

gra

the

aga

cru

Sel

sur

seat

to d

writ

cons

Con

inde

visio

Lége

Eme

ally e

of his

was

natio

prece

Emerson's revelation to the world is this Identity, which deifies the intuitions and the instincts of mankind. Upon it he builds his airy fabric; but as its foundations are sand, so are its walls mirage. From the identification of man and nature with God springs that doctrine of self-reliance which, whether they accepted it or not, stirred his countrymen to enthusiasm. To it, again, he owed his power of symbolism and his Swedenborgian theory of correspondences. Everywhere seeking identity and unity, he trained his eye to abnormal keenness. To him the diversity of nature is only illusory; persons, events, things are connected by laws of association which he struggles to discover. History itself is but the biography of the eternal mind. But when he argues that the blind, unconscious, irresistible laws of nature are precisely identical with the laws which operate voluntarily in conscious man, he only plays with the word law. To the same theory of Identity may be traced the mystical view of immortality which he at one time held. He who has reached the ineffable union is already immortal; death may bring a loss of conscious identity, but those who have realized the highest identity now on this earth enjoy eternal life. The same theory dictated his attitude towards historical Christianity. If man possesses a spiritual capacity to apprehend primary truths directly, he is above and outside theological controversy. Textual or literary criticism cannot assail intuitive faith. But if truth is thus disclosed immediately to each individual soul, there is no need of outward instruments of religion, of Church, sacraments, creeds, or ordinances. The same identification of man and nature with God governed his speculations concerning good and evil. Regarded only in the abstract, evil is the negation of good. Upon this metaphysical notion of evil Emerson seized. All created beings and existences, all capacities and actions, subserve the manifestation of this identity with all that is pure and holy. That God works good out of evil is one thing; that evil is good in itself is another. But Emerson refused to wait for the slow processes of evolution, just as he declined the doctrine of progressive revelation. Starting from the abstract notion of evil, he leaped to the conclusion that evil in the concrete is inseparably associated with good, and that men become good through the evil that is in them. Thus he conceived of evil as the exact reverse of all that the term implies, and denied the existence of that which he professed to explain. This acrobatic feat of the intellect inspired his glowing optimism, his unswerving confidence in the future of America, his indestructible faith in

human progress. But he also asserted that evil meets its reward here, that man is not irresponsible, but is punished sternly and relentlessly. This constitutes his doctrine of compensations, which is again founded on the theory of Identity, Man cannot escape divine laws, for they have their roots in the human soul. Punishment for evil is not postponed till after death; it is meted out at once; every day is a day of judgment. It is spiritual and not physical, even as the government of the soul is moral, not material, and it consists

in a decrease of spiritual being.

So far as Emerson recognized a Transcendental world above and behind the world of sense, his teaching was orthodox, and herein for religious-minded Americans lay his eminent value. But it is hardly necessary to point out the fatal consequences of obedience to instincts and intuitions. He bids his hearers obey the laws of the soul, for from the perception of these arises the moral sentiment which is the basis of all virtue. But he gives no rule to distinguish the higher from the lower propensities. He supplies no moral obligation except our own individual good; wise selfishness is the only sanction of his command. Man as a social being is wholly ignored in a creed which makes each individual the centre of the universe. Such a theory encourages every antinomian tendency, inevitably tends to moral and social disintegration, bids libertines and criminals obey the promptings of their passions, however licentious or lawless they may be. So again, if thought is not only free but absolutely sacred, every crude vagary claims the awe-inspiring title of Eternal Truth. Self-reliance subjects understanding to emotion, science to surmises; it enthrones undisciplined whims in the sovereign seat of reason, and cuts men loose from every sure anchorage to drift into the shoreless sea of universal Agnosticism.

Of the speculative dangers of such a creed Emerson's own writings afforded a striking illustration. He is wholly without constructive power; he frames no system, formulates no creed. Consequently his philosophy rises before us vague, indistinct, indeterminate, resembling in its shadowy vastness that strange vision of universal chaos with which Victor Hugo opens his Légende des Siècles. From the practical perils of his teaching Emerson was himself secure. His own noble ideal is personally exemplified in the purity of his aims, the fearless sincerity of his words, the stainless integrity of his life. His character was one of the noblest gifts which he bestowed upon his nation, and he taught more efficiently by practice than by precept. He was singularly endowed with that faith, hope,

vhich on it id, so and vhich, en to oolism Everyabnorusory; ciation ne bionat the v idenis man, f Idenhich he mion is is idennow on ited his sesses a ly, he is or litetruth is there is h, sacraof man ncerning il is the of evil

all capas identity

od out of

her. But

evolution, evelation.

ed to the associated

e evil that reverse of

ce of that

of the in-

ving confile faith in

Oct.

n

a a is g n

as

to so fac

for

ph

an

sci

his

on

this

info

yea

pro

Mo

volu fina

wor.

on v

sympathy, and spirit of effort which have belonged to the most useful teachers. A famous American character, Father Taylor, the sailor preacher of Boston, said of him: 'He must' go to heaven when he dies, for if he went to hell the Devil would not know what to do with him. But still he knows no more of the religion of the New Testament than Balaam's ass did of the principles of the Hebrew grammar.' The truth is forcibly, perhaps coarsely, put. But, in justice to his memory, it must be remembered that if he gave no map of the road, he indicated to thousands the direction of their journey, and lit up the gray and lampless void of their earthly pilgrimage. Many of those who followed him, as he traced the mystic stream of desire for all that is pure and noble upwards out of the low lying valleys, learnt at the foot of its inaccessible falls that the source of the Waters of Life is higher still, and yet within themselves.

ART. IV.-MORALITY AND ITS SANCTION.

 Progressive Morality. An Essay in Ethics. By THOMAS FOWLER, M.A., LL.D., F.S.A., President of Corpus Christi College, Wykeham Professor of Logic in the University of Oxford. (London and Oxford, 1884.)

2. The Principles of Morals (Introductory Chapters). By JOHN MATTHIAS WILSON, B.D., late President of Corpus Christi College, and Whyte's Professor of Moral Philosophy in the University of Oxford; and THOMAS FOWLER, M.A., President of Corpus Christi College, and Wykeham Professor of Logic in the University of Oxford, Honorary Doctor of Laws in the University of Edinburgh. (Oxford, 1886.)

3. The Principles of Morals. Part II. (Being the body of the Work.) By THOMAS FOWLER, D.D., &c., &c. (Oxford, 1887.)

THE doctrine of Evolution in England has experienced in a short time a complete change of fortune. Assailed at first with the utmost violence, regarded almost as a personal insult to humanity, it has come to be part of the stock-in-trade of everyone who is minded to treat things on a scientific basis.

o the Tather must Devil ws no n's ass ruth is emory, oad, he and lit image, mystic out of ble falls

and yet

Oct.

ON.

Corpus in the 84.) rs). By

f Corpus oral Phi-THOMAS lege, and y of Oxcersity of

body of cc. (Ox-

nced in a d at first onal insult n-trade of ific basis.

It has been applied in every sphere of mental activity, to every aspect of human life. Rightly or wrongly, it has come to be used as a spell which is expected to prevail over the most obstinate and difficult facts. Few would maintain that this change of front has been productive of unmixed good; it is inevitable that some errors must creep in which maturer reflection will eradicate; but at the same time it is impossible to be blind to the very important accession to its power which philosophy has derived from the adoption of this theory. Among the more prominent gains which have thus come to us should be named the added significance given to the ideas of progress and history. These are now seen to have a principle working through them which accounts for them, and makes them rational. The present has grown out of the struggles of the past; it expresses more clearly what earlier ages were trying to express; so there is a unity which binds all ages together. There is no room for accident; the whole is orderly, everything is in its place. Before, facts were grouped according to some arbitrary and accidental principle: now they are seen in the light of a uniform law of change. The various methods which were in vogue before for coordinating and explaining facts threaten to be completely set aside now in favour of the historical method. The search for real causes, which once was a matter of such intense interest to the metaphysician, is fast falling into disrepute, at least in some minds; and we are assured that the arrangement of the facts, just as they are, under the form of evolution, will do for us all, and more than all, that the older school of metaphysicians hoped; for will it not at once explain the present. and anticipate the future? What more could philosopher or scientist desire than this?

The books named above represent the application of the historical method to morals. The first mentioned, the Essay on Progressive Morality, runs very close to the others. For this Professor Fowler is responsible alone. The other, as he informs us in his preface, is the result of a plan formed some years ago by the late Professor Wilson and himself. They proposed to publish jointly a work on the Principles of Morals, and those chapters which are contained in the first volume of the present work 'had received Professor Wilson's final imprimatur.' The second volume consists chiefly of work from Professor Fowler's hand, though here too certain large sections (named in the Advertisement) are either based on written or oral communications from him, or were jointly composed by him and Professor Fowler. Probably no two

men would undertake to write a book together unless their opinions were fairly coincident on the subject which they proposed to treat; but certainly the agreement between our two authors is remarkable. This is partly accounted for in the preface to *Progressive Morality*, where Professor Fowler acknowledges the influence of his friend's mind upon his own. 'No one,' he says, 'can have been brought into close contact with so powerful a mind as that of Professor Wilson, without deriving from it much stimulus and retaining many traces of its influence.' These facts make it unnecessary for us to treat the books separately, as they, to all intents and purposes,

embody one ethical theory.

This theory, as we have already remarked, is an historical Our authors 'deliberately set aside' (p. 114) 'the à priori method, or any form of it, transcendental or intuitive.' They 'adopt an à posteriori method, basing moral ideas and principles on such facts as admit of verification by experience and observation' (ibid.). They regard moral science, in a somewhat old-fashioned way, as a part of practical philosophy, standing in a more or less definable relation to other sciences, and corresponding to an art. The means at our disposal, then, 'for the study of moral science consist in a knowledge of the results of those sciences which throw light (I) on the nature of the individual organism, that is, on the man himself; (2) on the medium, whether material or social, in which he exists. Any moral system otherwise constructed can have no solid foundation of fact, and necessarily partakes of a metaphysical and transcendental, that is, as we conceive, of a purely fanciful character' (p. 12). An analysis of the nature of man is the starting-point of their exposition. Such an analysis might have proceeded by simple introspection, as in former times was the case. This, however, is at once set The analysis which is to be adequate is an analysis of man as he has manifested his nature, in his progress from barbarism to civilization, in other words, as he has manifested his nature through the whole course of his evolution. To introduce this we have in the First Part an account of moral speculation in England since the time of Hobbes, as well as a short statement and criticism of the views of Kant. Here too the historical method prevails; for the point of this section of the book is to show how various aspects of the nature of man have been dwelt on by previous thinkers, or brought into exaggerated prominence—aspects which the present work places in their right relation one to another. 'We do not mean that our system will be eclectic. Any system, however,

be or or we

or

W

n

ir

of un had of with she dit with ent this goe

his fess hur the (ibi our por that these no pexe

and

The ness or consubs

and

which pretends to completeness ought to be found, on examination, to have taken up and absorbed the elements of truth in previous systems, as well as to afford the means of accounting for their exaggerations and errors' (p. 23, 24).

The nature of man, examined by this method, is seen to be a complex one. It consists of certain definite tendencies -self-regarding, sympathetic, and semi-social. order to his organic perfection, require to be brought to bear on one end. Left to themselves, the self-regarding feelings would make all society impossible. The sympathetic feelings, on the other hand, unless duly modified by egoistic considerations, would tend towards the destruction of individual life. The semi-social feelings, the love of approbation and the fear of disapprobation, are involved in, if not the product of, the union of men in a society. These three classes of feelings have come into prominence at different stages in the history of mankind. 'In the earlier periods of society the struggle with nature is so intense, that the effort to supply food and shelter and to ward off external injuries absorbs almost all a man's energies.' 'The resentful passions,' under these conditions, 'ally themselves with the self-regarding propensions, or with those narrow sympathies which alone the primitive man entertains' (Part I. p. 130). So far man is a savage, half-animal thing, with all his special characteristics undeveloped. As time goes on, however, the struggle for mere life becomes less intense, and he begins to have time and inclination for the display of his sympathetic powers. These sympathetic feelings Professor Fowler regards 'as coeval with the social form of human life' (vol. ii. p. 74). He wisely declines to enter into the question of their origin under still earlier conditions, before the human species was as yet fully evolved. This, he remarks (ibid.), 'carries us back to so distant a period in the history of our race, as to admit of no direct verification, and . . . transports us from the region of Ethics, properly so called, into that of speculative psychology.' The mere combination of these principles, however, is not sufficient. There is, as yet, no principle of guidance. 'This want gives occasion for the exercise of the reason, whose function it is to regulate, control, and adjust all the various principles of our nature, and adapt them to the varying conditions of our existence' (Part I. p. 131). The reason, then, reflects on our conduct, estimates its rightness or wrongness, and so gives rise to a feeling of satisfaction or dissatisfaction. The process of reflection, judgment, and subsequent emotion is performed so often, that it eventually comes to be regarded as instantaneous and immediate. 'So

their protwo
the
r acown.
ntact
thout
ces of

treat

ooses,

Oct.

orical 'the itive.' s and rience in a sophy, ences, sposal, vledge on the mself: ich he ave no metaof a nature ich an n, as in ice set nalysis ss from nifested To in-

f moral
well as
Here
section
ature of
ght into
at work
do not
owever,

it

th

is

m

res

mo

the

me

mo

(ibi

A

mu

un

lea

'be

goo

goo

par

eve

and

readily, in fact, do the moral actions and qualities which occur to our minds range themselves under classes, or associate themselves with similar actions or qualities experienced in the past, that, as life advances, we seldom have to pause before pronouncing a judgment' (Part II, p. 207). This is the account of the immediacy of Conscience, as the faculty of judgment which deals with past actions. By anticipation, as it were, it acts as a guide to future conduct. This, however, is an indirect use of it. 'The satisfaction or dissatisfaction which results from the contemplation of an act is so intimately associated with the act itself, that, in future, no sooner is the idea of the act presented to the mind, than it at once suggests the satisfaction or dissatisfaction which was previously experienced in reflecting upon it' (Part II. p. 221). There is yet another faculty which is operative in the moral progress of mankind—the Imagination. It is to this that the whole history of moral ideals belongs. We observe 'a man acting in certain relations in a manner which approves itself to us. We have also observed the same man, or another man, acting similarly under similar, though more or less different, circumstances. After a number of observations of this kind, we are able, by successive acts of reproductive imagination, of abstraction and comparison, to attach a meaning to the general terms "just" or "justly," by which we ourselves, or others, denominate these actions' (Part II. p. 290). In the same way we form conceptions of courage, temperance, and the like. These general terms are something more than mere abstrac-The process by which they are formed gives them expanded meaning, so that they come to stand for 'almost all circumstances of a given kind which can occur' (Part II. p. 291). The combination of various particular ideals produces 'the more general conception of perfect moral goodness, which is embodied, in the concrete, in the perfectly good or righteous man' (Part II. p. 292). Thus man becomes conscious of himself as a moral being. He knows that he has possibilities—'a dignity and moral worth to which nothing in this world bears resemblance,' and this consciousness 'produces pleasures at once ennobling and consolatory' for this life, and 'strengthens and supports the hope and belief in another life . . . where, purified from all taint of original selfishness, we shall live in the enjoyment of those elevating pleasures which seem so alien to the lower and more animal part of our nature' (Part I. p. 132). Thus the conscience of man develops out of the condition where there is none.

This theoretical account of its development is brought

XIIM

occur ciate

n the efore

count ment

ere, it

n in-

which

nately is the

ggests

expe-

is yet ess of

whole

acting

to us.

acting

ircum-

we are

of ab-

general others,

ne way

e like.

bstrac-

s them

almost

Part II.

als pro-

odness,

good or

es con-

he has

thing in

roduces

life, and ther life

ness, we

into connexion with the facts of to-day by means of an elaborate analysis of the various moral and immoral qualities into their most elementary factors. This is done under the head of the sympathetic, self-regarding, and semi-social feelings, and occupies a large portion of the Second Part of the Principles of Morals. Much of it is very able, and the whole gives evidence of a very practical mind, full of common sense, animated by a strong desire for truth, and an intention no less firm to treat facts without any hesitation or fear. We are far from agreeing with much that is to be found in this volume, but it will be better to postpone criticisms till we have stated Professor Fowler's positions more fully.

We have sketched the manner in which Professor Fowler conceives the moral consciousness of man to have arisen. We have still to describe the functions of this moral consciousness now that it has so far developed. We have to explain what sort of cases it judges, what is the sanction of it, and the justification of its existence in this form and in no other. As regards the first point, Professor Fowler holds that a moral judgment primarily belongs to cases where there is a conflict between opposing desires. According as the man chooses rightly or wrongly, lets the right or the wrong desires have the upper hand, so he is approved or condemned.

'All those acts, it seems to me (and from the characteristics of the acts those of the qualities, which give birth to them, can easily be inferred), which elicit a distinctively moral feeling have been the result of some conflict amongst the various appetites, desires, and affections, or, to use the more ordinary phraseology, of a conflict of motives' (Part II. p. 182).

'When the good or evil inducements have been eliminated by the formation respectively of a bad or a good habit, it seems to me . . . that the proper object of our blame or praise is the habit or character, and not the act; or, in other words, the permanent moral condition, and not the volition immediately preceding action' (ibid.).

A further point is that actions falling under a moral judgment must be of sufficient importance; they must not be trivial, unworthy of serious notice. The conflict of motives, which leads to an act fit for moral judgment, is always a conflict 'between a man's lower and higher good, or between his own good and the greater good of others, or . . . between the lesser good of some, reinforced by considerations of self-interest or partiality, and the greater good of others, not so reinforced, or even, occasionally, between the pleasure or advantage of others and a disproportionate injury to himself' (Part II. p. 183).

es which of our an deve-

brought

fo

a

fa

de

tu

W

Pa

'n

th

of

his

of

Fo

'to

gro

is s

the

the

ger

con

edu

tion

suri

a sl

has

with

app

The right course, therefore, involves some degree of sacrifice. Where the path of sacrifice is chosen, provided it does not involve an outrageously disproportionate sacrifice, we praise the agent; otherwise he is open to censure. Such cases must always be regarded as instances of a class, or we shall find ourselves ensnared in the complexity of particular circumstances, and our moral judgment vitiated in consequence. We must always, in other words, consider what would be the result if such action became universal. This will prevent our being deluded by the apparently satisfactory results of a bad action, or terrified by the evils which seem to attend upon a good one. At this point we come to consider what is the ground upon which such actions as those described are praised and blamed. It is simply that they tend to the wellbeing of the race as a whole. This seems to Professor Fowler to be the one common point in the long series of variations which the moral sentiment has passed through. The cause of the changes in the direction of moral approbation and disapprobation has been a continually growing knowledge of the real truth about actions. Acts once allowed are now known to be detrimental to the wellbeing of society, and are therefore forbidden. Moral rules take their origin 'in the effort of men to adapt themselves to the circumstances, social and physical, in which they are placed.' And the test of conduct thus attained is applied in two ways-either consciously by reflective men, or semi-consciously by the community at large. It expresses itself in the legal code, and in the general social sanction, and is closely connected with religion. The relation between morality and religion is thus expressed:—' Morality lends to the object of religious regard its most endearing attributes, and receives in return a sacred and venerable character, appealing especially to our feelings of reverence and awe.' 2 This, of course, only belongs to the time when the religious feeling is exalted and purified; at lower levels religion often retards morality. So morality has grown with the growth of the human race. As the medium in which the human organism had to dwell became more and more complex, so his moral ideas became wider and his conception of wellbeing fuller. In obedience to the gregarious instincts which seem to be primary in him, aggregates of individuals are gradually formed. The family—the tribe—the state these are the successive stages of man's social evolution. Throughout these stages there are continually developing

¹ Progressive Morality, p. 102.

² Principles of Morals, pt. ii. p. 346.

Oct.

fice.

not

aise iust

find

um-

nce.

the

our

on a

are well-

wler

tions

ause

and ge of

now

d are

the

social est of

con-

comnd in

with thus

egard

ngs of

e time

levels

n with

com-

tion of

stincts viduals

state-

olution.

eloping

those regulative powers of reason and imagination by which impulse is to be kept in check. All man's varied activities in the field of knowledge, of art, of religion, are influenced by, and in their turn influence, the moral idea. What, then, is the justification of this process? What justification is there for the test which, according to this theory, is applied at every stage of moral evolution? Nothing external, Professor Fowler answers, neither religion nor law; nothing less than the 'very make and constitution of our nature.' Because we are of such a nature, therefore we must follow such a line of progress. The existence of, and the need for harmonizing, our various powers and faculties is all along the sole justification for our test, the cause and starting-point of our evolution. So we return in the end to that complex human nature, the analysis of which was the point from which we started.

A question which has been conspicuous by its absence so far is that of the freedom of the will. There is a chapter devoted in Part II. of Principles of Morals, and to it we now turn. Professor Fowler's avowal of something very like contempt for metaphysics prepares us for the subordinate place which it occupies in his theory, and the treatment of it in Part II. ch. ix. In the first place (p. 301) we are assured that 'not the least important or satisfactory result of a study' of this question 'will be to show how little bearing the issue of the dispute, whatever it may be, has on the practical conduct of human life.' There follows then a short sketch of the history of the controversy, with special emphasis on the views of Kant, and then at p. 331 the exposition of Professor Fowler's theory begins. He finds the most satisfactory clue 'to guide us through this labyrinth of controversy' in the growth of that power of self-control and self-mastery which is so intimately associated with what is called the will.' In the childhood of the race, as well as of the individual, man is the victim of impulse. He has no settled plan of life, no general idea which can control the momentary desires. control he gradually acquires as his character grows through education; and in the end he attains a power of self-assertion—a faculty of impressing his own character upon his surroundings, which is a sort of freedom. Yet all along it is a slavery. 'If he has ceased to be the slave of passion, he has become the slave of character' (p. 334). This, together with an emphatic statement of the incompatibility of moral approbation and disapprobation with the theory of necessity,

¹ Progressive Morality, p. 130.

and a further assertion of the unpractical character of the whole dispute, forms Professor Fowler's contribution to the question.

So far we have endeavoured to state the theory embodied in these volumes, without offering any criticisms upon it. It has been our aim to leave no points untouched which contribute to the clear understanding of the theory. We have not as yet entered into any details in connexion with the analysis of the human feelings, partly because it is not easy to bring into the compass of a review anything like a complete account of so extensive a subject, and partly because it is by the moral theory contained in it that a book really stands or The treatment of outlying or subsidiary questions cannot fail to be influenced by the general theoretical tendency of the author's thought. There are, however, one or two points which it will be well to treat before we pass on to the criticism of the moral theory as a whole. As regards the historical part of the first volume, we cannot but be struck by the fact that the moralists there described are all of the English School with the single exception of Kant. This is partly accounted for by the following statement from p. 23: 'Ethical speculation is at once the peculiar and the most fruitful product of English philosophy, and any modern treatise on the subject must, whether it acknowledge its obligations or not, necessarily build on the foundations of its predecessors.' Another reason, which may have operated with our authors, is that the most famous foreign writers were metaphysicians: Spinoza and Hegel for instance; and therefore they could at once be classed as weavers of delusive fancies. Such an omission may be wise, but it certainly The notices of those distorts the aspect of the history. moralists who are treated are concise and clear, and the criticisms keen and, on the whole, discriminating, though, of course, the strong anti-metaphysical bias forms an important disturbing factor. This is very noticeable in the account of Clarke and Kant. Great emphasis is laid on Hartley and on Bentham, as would be expected. Of these the former is a much-neglected author, whose works deserve more attention than they get. It is interesting to compare the account of Bernard de Mandeville in this work with the ideal construction of his character and work in Browning's latest volume. To Fowler and Wilson he is almost as Mackintosh describes him, 'the buffoon and sophister of the ale-house.' His value is that he brings forward for the first time the importance of the semi-social feelings. He maintains the impossibility of raising 'any multitudes into a populous, rich,

For view the Olifeet sta

sel

tas

I

a

tl

the particle of the particle o

Thi or dea dist pres serie he s

exe

prese the f and flourishing nation, or, when so raised, of keeping them in that condition, without the assistance of what we call evil, social and moral' (p. 84). Pride or Vanity is the feeling by which men are raised. With this compare Browning, Parleyings with Certain People (p. 33):—

No: as with body so deals law with soul
That's stung to strength through weakness, strives for good
Through evil—earth its race-ground: heaven its goal
Presumably: so far I understood
Thy teaching long ago.

The exigences of analysis seem to involve Professor Fowler in difficulties occasionally. He is obliged by the very conditions of his work to bring most of the virtues and vices under his various heads, and we cannot help thinking that he has not been always successful. To take one instance. Obedience is arranged here under the head of self-regarding It is said to imply a developed underfeelings (p. 31). standing, a developed imagination, an advanced condition of self-control, a well-formed habit of calculating remoter advantages, and of making more immediate desires give way to Surely this is a very complicated analysis for a comparatively simple thing. Would it not be truer to say that obedience may spring from two sources-from fear and from love; that in the one case it is simply a self-regarding fear of personal harm, in the other one of many modes of expressing a habit of mind which is not self-regarding at all. We should observe, on the other hand, that Professor Fowler has some very good remarks upon the love of knowledge and of truth (p. 45). It is not sufficiently kept in mind that this is a real virtue, and one which requires cultivation and exercise.1

There is one other point of more general importance with regard to which we cannot wholly agree with Professor Fowler. This is his optimism. It pervades the whole book in a more or less defined manner, but it comes out most strongly in dealing with social questions, like those of competition, class-distinction, and co-operation, and the like. He admits the presence of certain evils, but does not seem to think them serious. Thus, on the question of labour and capital (p. 37), he says:—

'There may be exceptional cases in which the labour of the present is underpaid or overtaxed for the benefit of the labour of the future, or in which the interests of the operatives are sacrificed

Oct.

died It con-

have the easy

is by ds or tions ten-

ne or on to gards at be

re all Kant. from d the odern

s oblis prewith were there-

thereelusive tainly those

igh, of cortant ount of cy and

ner is a tention ount of al con-

latest kintosh -house.

me the ins the us, rich,

VIIM

¹ But compare p. 69 on the relation of Sympathy and Law.

a

tl

u

sl

W

th

al

de

fo

It

CC

sh

ou

ev

m

do

on

in

inc

of

na

no

of

det

the

to

law

cip

whi

whi

who

hist

to the selfish enjoyments of the capitalist. At least as frequently, however, unfounded complaints are made of the rapacity of the capitalist, when he is really taking no more than is sufficient to compensate him for his risk, his trouble of superintendence, and the loan of his capital.'

This leaves the impression that on the whole there is very little real wrong, the exceptional cases on one side being balanced by those on the other. The remedies are 'ethical and intellectual.' The workman is to learn 'the nature and true functions of labour and capital,' the capitalist is to use his capital honestly and well, and the workman is to display 'a cheerful acquiescence in at least so much of his condition as is determined for him by the inexorable laws of Economics,' 'It has been suggested, too, and, as it appears to us, with considerable justice, that the relations of the labourer and capitalist might be vastly improved both by law and by custom' (p. 38). Similar remedies are proposed for the strong feuds between class and class, but this time legislation is deprecated. We are prepared to agree with Professor Fowler in thinking that class-feeling 'is, at all times, a feeling of questionable propriety ' (p. 100), and we extend our censure to the various forms of social feud mentioned in this book; but we think the remedies are singularly inadequate for the disease. It is surely a very pressing evil, and hardly to be kept waiting until education, ethical and intellectual, has made its way through the various strata of society. We do not deny the value of such education; but it is useless if not illustrated by examples. Men must recognize in practice that they owe to their neighbours real sacrifice, and not merely the odds and ends of time or money which they happen not to want themselves. We dare not hope too much; so perhaps we are unpractical; for on Professor Fowler's plan 'we may fairly look forward to a time when, within such limits as our own organization and the constitution of the material universe admit, the happiness of men and the stability of nations will be secured '(p. 41).

These, however, are details. It is time that we passed on to a more general criticism of the whole theory. We have seen that from the outset a great parade is made of indifference to à priori theories. They are fanciful, they are unscientific, they render progress impossible either in moral theory or practice; worst of all, they are formed independently of facts. We are unable, however, to resign the belief that these accusations are untenable, and we venture to think also that had Professor Fowler adhered consistently

the to the rery eing nical and use play ition nics. o us. ourer d by the ation essor eling nsure ook: e for lly to l, has Ve do if not actice d not they e too fessor when,

Oct.

tly.

sed on e have ndifferare unmoral d indeign the venture istently

consti-

of men

to this position the failure of his own theory would have saved us the trouble of arguing in favour of our own views. For Professor Fowler is not really consistent with himself. He seems to us to hold an erroneous view of the meaning of evolution, but to have applied it in a more or less unexceptionable manner. Evolution, as we said above, makes history rational by showing in it the working of a definite principle. It is not a blind succession of events which simply follow one another. The events of history regarded from the point of view of evolution follow a definite and rational law. If we think of the evolution of the physical organism of animals under this form, the central point of interest is not the vague, shapeless thing from which they arose, but the ideal type towards which they all tended by increasingly complex reaction upon environment. This is the key to the evolution: this is the sole ground which we have for calling it an evolution at all. So with morality. The central point of interest is not the state of barbarism out of which civilization has probably developed, but that ideal condition which has all along formed the motive and significance of the successive changes. It is not necessary that this should have been present in full consciousness throughout; indeed it is obvious that it has not fully come into consciousness yet. Only it is necessary that the idea which the evolution is gradually expressing should be a single one, and that it should be more clearly To use an Aristotelian phrase, in outlined at each stage. evolution as elsewhere the end is prior to the means. This may be called, perhaps, an à priori idea of evolution, but it does not follow from that that it is an inadequate or fanciful one. Professor Fowler, as we have said, seems to recognize in practice what he denies in theory. When he comes to inquire what is the justification of the progressive movement of morality, he finds it in the actual conditions of human nature. We could desire nothing better than this. We do not know how far Professor Fowler would accept our version of his statement, but it seems to us to come to this, that the determining cause of the changes which have taken place in the evolution of morality have been all along the ideal type to which they tend. The progress has been governed by law: that is, the gradual assertion, for instance, of the principle of self-sacrifice is not a mere accident of the position in which men found themselves, but depends on that purpose which history is slowly working out. To a believer in a God whose will guides and supports the order of nature and history, this conception would appear to present little difficulty. Even though it is à priori in a sense, it does not seem to make progress impossible; the fixed ideal of humanity comes forth gradually, just as the changeless will of God is progressively revealed. There is a considerable degree of misconception attaching to these terms à priori and à posteriori. It is usually assumed that an à priori method starts with an absolute disregard for facts, forms certain purely imaginary conceptions, and expects to fit them on to the facts afterwards. Such a method as this would deserve all the scorn which Professor Fowler could heap on it. But this is not what we mean by an à priori method. We understand by this phrase a method which deals with facts, but with facts as expressive of a rational principle, and not simply in and for themselves. An apt illustration of this will be found in Professor Fowler's remarks upon the State. To him the State is an artificial product, an aggregate of individuals, and nothing more. The existence of it is not to his mind involved in the nature of man. It is a convenience and nothing more. To Professor Green, on the other hand, it is a natural and inevitable consequence of the constitution of mankind. It is the sphere in which alone man's capabilities are realized, and its end is to give to the largest number of individuals the fullest possible self-realization. Accordingly we find in Professor Green a much more definite view of the limits within which legislation may interfere. He has an ideal before him by which he can estimate facts. Placing as he does the chief emphasis on the organic unity of the State, he is less afraid than Professor Fowler of those curtailments of merely individual liberty which legislation frequently involves. Professor Fowler, on the other hand, in his close adherence to mere facts, can give hardly any help at all. Legislation sometimes does more harm than good; sometimes is advantageous. That is the experience of the past. It offers no suggestions as to the causes of past failure, or hopes of future success. It is simply sceptical.

There is a second point closely connected with the foregoing which we think Professor Fowler has overlooked, and we trace to it many of our differences from him. It often happens that those who use the idea of evolution to coordinate facts betray a distaste for the admission of new facts. They seem to imply that because one stage has arisen out of another, the higher condition of things can be explained in terms of the lower without any new terms at all. It is frequently implied, and sometimes directly stated, for instance, that man's activities and man's life can be explained or W an

18

of hig th the an an ca an

wh CO an the eve So thi me

wa Su sta life int do psy one

de

the nec rou or ing der mo

sen

tha wit inte infi par The

thir in a to s

s not will rable i and ethod ertain m on eserve But nder-, but not f this State. ate of is not conn the of the alone to the ealizamore av intimate rganic vler of egislaother hardly harm xperiises of ptical. e fored, and often to coof new arisen be exat all.

ed, for

olained

or described in terms of less developed activities and life. Whereas the truth lies in the opposite direction. The poorer and less developed forms of life are significant in the history of the evolution of the world, just because they hint at a higher state yet to come. And it seems to stand to reason, that the appearance of this higher condition of things places the organism in a wholly new relation to the world. To take an instance, for which we are indebted to Dr. Martineau. An animal which has no sense of sight or sound, but is only capable of reaction on touch, has a certain life possible to it, and no more. The development of sight places the animal which possesses it in an entirely new condition. It has a new command over the world, new possibilities of development, and the terms which might have been adequate to describe the life of the lower creature are entirely unfit for the higher. even though it be true that sight is a special form of touch. So, again, human life, whatever its history, is a wholly new thing; and it is entirely impossible to explain it in terms of merely animal life. Evolution may have made the lines of demarcation between one species and another indistinct and wavy, but it has not abolished the differences of species. Such obvious truths as this, perhaps, may seem scarcely worth stating; they have an application, however, within human We do not suppose that mankind ever existed as merely intellectual, without even a rudimentary conscience; but we do not believe that conscience can be explained in merely psychological terms .The moral aspect of life is a different one to the intellectual; the conscience is, in a way, a new sense. We are warned against this idea in Part I. p. 48, on the ground that 'the decisions [of conscience] seem to arise necessarily, though often by a complicated and circuitous route, out of the operations of the reason and the gratification or disappointment of the sympathetic and self-regarding feelings.' This is exactly what we do not believe. We do not deny that intellectual development is a valuable assistance to moral growth; but it is a matter of quite ordinary experience. that an extreme sensitiveness to moral claims may exist without any high intellectual attainments, and that very high intellectual powers are compatible with feeble morality. The infirmities of genius are half proverbial, while almost any parish priest could give evidence in support of the other case. Then, again, remorse for an evil deed is a wholly different thing from the annoyance one feels at having made a mistake in a sum, or calculated chances wrongly. Only if we have reason to suppose that our carelessness was culpable and serious, do VOL. XXVII.-NO. LIII.

we feel anything approaching moral self-condemnation. Conscience, we maintain, looks at facts in a new light, and estimates them on new principles. They appear as the expression of the character of man, far more than as involving this or that result. It does not treat them so much as instances of a class, as in their relation to the character of the man under the given conditions of temptation or doubt. judgment falls on persons in action, and tends always to become a simple judgment of right or wrong. There are countless ways of confusing the issue, and of deriving false utterances from conscience. There is often a strong desire to use irrelevant facts as excuses, and to neglect the real conditions of the will. But none the less there is a general feeling that life may move on the wrong road or the right, and this tends to express itself in the judgments of conscience. And when we are convicted by our conscience of wrong-doing, we are convicted, as Dr. Martineau has pointed out, of having done all the wrong in our power at the time, and not of having made an erroneous calculation of results, or of having omitted to consider our action sub specie æternitatis. Most of this Professor Fowler has ignored. He admits, indeed, 'that when we come to the particular acts of individual persons or of definite aggregates of persons . . . it seems impossible, in forming our judgment, to keep out of sight either the predominant motive or motives, on the one side, or, on the other, the results' (p. 196). But moral actions are generally judged as a class, and then the attention is directed to results. 'Murder and lying, for instance, regarded as classes of acts, seem to be reprobated on account of their pernicious consequences, with little or no regard to the motives which usually give birth to them' (ibid.). This concentration on results seems to us to have involved Professor Fowler, in company with Bentham, in a juristic view of life, which is only indirectly moral at all. Results have to be taken into consideration by a jurist, because, as we pointed out before, the end of the State is to allow the fullest self-realization to all the individuals composing it. The jurist has to take care, therefore, that no one has his liberty unjustly limited. And they are useful to the moralist, pure and simple, because they show him the general tendency of actions. If he believes that there is a purpose in history, they illustrate individual life, and out of them he learns as much as he can of the permanent principles which rule human progress. But, for all that, morality is primarily personal; questions of conscience are for the individual soul to decide for itself with such helps as may be

Oct. Conestipresances man The ys to e are ire to ondieeling l this And g, we aving ot of aving ost of 'that ons or ole, in e preother, udged esults. f acts, consesually results npany y indiend of e indirefore, ey are show es that al life,

This leads on to the consideration of the subject which Professor Fowler has placed last in his book—the connexion of morality and religion. The true connexion, as we conceive it, lies through conscience. Conscience, as we observed a moment ago, is closely connected with Personality. It is recognized as giving the decisive judgment upon all the deepest questions in the moral life. Its utterances, as we have said, fall on persons, and they come with the authority of a law. And this law, though external in the sense that it is independent of the individual will, is yet felt to correspond to the truest affinities of the human self. What is the nature of the law? Is it an adequate account of it to say that it is a short abstract statement of moral facts just as they are? Surely not; for it has to do with what ought to be, not in the same sense with what is. And the consciousness of having acted in defiance of a natural uniformity brings with it no sense of moral wrong. Penitence is not the state of mind of the unsuccessful aëronaut. Prometheus rebels against the hard irrational conditions which bind the human race, and yet glories in the suffering which the envy of the gods inflicts. It is wholly different with a sin. Then there comes a feeling of a law broken which never ought to have been broken-of a breach, not of a uniformity only, but a law. And the question is then—What or who imposes this law? Surely nothing less than a perfect moral Being, as personal as ourselves. We conquer the laws of nature by obeying them. We never conquer the moral law. We can never use it for our own purposes; it binds and conditions us everywhere and always. Civilized man becomes gradually free of nature: he never becomes free of the moral law. Surely we have in this view, for which again we are largely indebted to Dr. Martineau, a truer account of the relations of morality and religion. Religion, resting upon a personal God, is the climax to which morality leads. It, too, like morality, has had a history. It has seemed at times to defy the moral law, at times it has aided in developing it. But the real relation between the two is only fully seen when the best and highest truths of morality are found to be the starting-point of a new sphere of human activity, where obedience to a law is transformed into love of a personal God.

So we have passed in review some of the more striking points in these volumes. We have not space to discuss many others which are worth discussion—the freedom of the will, for instance, or the relation of pleasure to desire. But we have said enough to give a general idea of the tone and character

nanent

at, mo-

for the

nay be

C

a

fo the

th sa H

of the books as a whole. We confess that we are considerably disappointed in them. The style is somewhat pompous and stilted, and the bias under which they are written considerably diminishes from their usefulness. Professor Fowler might no doubt urge that he and Professor Wilson had persuaded themselves that metaphysic is cumbrous nonsense before the books were begun, and that therefore there was no reason for complicating the problems by polemics. There is something to be said for this; but still we cannot agree that it is wise to leave aside such a widely represented mental attitude as Transcendentalism in its various forms. Its very extensiveness, one would think, would be enough to show that it is not mere fancy, but does answer to a real need of the human mind—a need as real as that of morality itself. Such a desire is not satisfied by logical divisions of virtues and vices, or by definitions of their names; and one is the more disappointed because, so far as we have discovered, there is no addition made in these volumes to positions which Professor Green spent so much labour in confuting. But we must restrain ourselves. We would avoid that vice of excessive criticism which Professor Fowler condemns in his Progressive Morality (p. 192). We would not wish to be less 'keenly alive to the difficulties' of the subject than to the errors in treatment which we seem to ourselves to have discovered. We cannot but admire the perseverance and real moral zeal which these volumes display. We do not ignore the freedom with which Professor Fowler has adopted the new knowledge which science has brought to bear upon the subject. But yet, after all, the problems seem to us to be treated in too fatally easy The human race is still very far from being ideal; a fashion. and we cannot but believe that any theory which will help much towards the moral development of mankind will be one which takes far more account than this of the vast importance of personality, and the tremendous strain which lies upon the individual will.

ably and ably

t no

the

1 for

hing wise

e as

sive-

not

man

esire

r by

nted

ition

reen

train

cism

ality

the

ment

nnot

these

hich

vhich

after

easy

deal;

help

e one

tance

n the

ART. V.—THE GREAT FLOOD.

The Mammoth and the Flood: an Attempt to confront the Theory of Uniformity with the Facts of recent Geology. By Henry H. Howorth, M.P. (London, 1887.)

A CENTURY or more ago, when those dreary treatises called Theories of the Earth were still thought profitable reading, geologists—if we may anticipate the use of a term not yet invented-were divided into Neptunists and Vulcanists. The former invoked water, the latter fire, as the agent which had moulded the crust of our earth; and, animated by that virulence which mere theorizing always engenders, the rival sects set up a fierce controversy, amidst which the still small voice of science gained little or no attention. Gradually, however, after long years wasted in baseless wranglings, the truth came to be recognized that patient observation of facts, and notably the study of the organic remains distinctive of different strata, would lead to more profitable results than mere theory. In other words, the modern science of geology came into being, and a host of observers directed their best energies to 'getting the rocks into their right order in the field.' When this task had been to a certain extent accomplished, and the strata, not merely of England, but of Europe, had been mapped out, it was not unnatural to seek for a theory of causation that would embrace the observed phenomena. Then it was that the late Sir Charles Lyell taught, in his Principles of Geology, of which the first edition appeared in 1830, that it was unnecessary to suppose that violent cataclysms had rent our globe asunder, for that the causes now in operation, if sufficient time be granted to them, were powerful enough to account, not merely for 'conformable' stratification, but even for the most extensive dislocations and disruptions. theory was no creation of the fancy, invented by a scholar dreaming at his desk; it was the result of long labour in the field, and careful study of the recorded observations of others. Nor can it, by this time, be called a new thing. More than half a century has elapsed since its first promulgation, and during the whole of that period it has been steadily winning the approval of those most competent to judge it. Rien n'est sacré pour un sabreur, however; and in these latter days Mr. Howorth has donned his armour, and ridden forth like a knight errant of old (the simile is his, not ours) to do battle

be

n

re

S

tie

tre

th

bu

co

su

SO

Ri

wh

wh

an

for

ing

inc

suc

with what he terms 'a metaphysical and scholastic delusion.' We are afraid that, like Don Quixote, he has not unfrequently mistaken a windmill for a giant; that he has failed to comprehend the theory he would fain banish from our text-books and our lecture-rooms. But, notwithstanding, he has written a very interesting treatise, which theologians, as well as men of science, will find profitable reading. It will be readily understood that our space will not allow us to notice in detail a volume which contains upwards of five hundred closely-printed pages, replete with facts, and often, as the nature of the case demands, dealing with the technicalities of science, but we will try to state with fairness the main points of the argument.

Before entering on this task it will be best, we think, to extract from Mr. Howorth's preface his own statement of the conclusions which, in his belief, are proved by the facts which he has brought together.

'They prove, in the first place, that a very great cataclysm or catastrophe occurred at the close of the mammoth period, by which that animal, with its companions, were overwhelmed over a very large part of the earth's surface. Secondly, that this catastrophe involved a widespread flood of water, which not only killed the animals, but also buried them under continuous beds of loam and gravel. Thirdly, that the same catastrophe was accompanied by a very great and sudden change of climate in Siberia, by which the animals which had previously lived in fairly temperate conditions were frozen in their flesh under the ground, and have remained frozen ever since. Fourthly, that this catastrophe took place when man was already occupying the earth, and constitutes the gap which is almost universally admitted to exist between so-called palæolithic and neolithic man. Fifthly, that this catastrophe is, in all probability, the same one pointed out in the traditions of so many races as the primæval flood, from which their legendary history begins. Sixthly, that, while this flood was exceedingly widespread, considerable areas escaped; and from those insular areas man, animals, and plants spread out again and reoccupied those districts which had been desolated. Wherever we turn in the temperate regions of the world we seem to be on the track of this great catastrophe, which swept away the greater part of an ancient fauna, and which especially destroyed the larger and more unwieldy animals, allowing the smaller ones to escape, and which forms a great dividing line in the recent biological history of Australia as well as Europe, of Siberia as well as America. This vast effort seems from inexorable evidence to have been due to the exertion of some cataclysmic force by which the earth's crust was greatly disturbed, not merely locally, but over a large part of its surface. It was in consequence of this dislocation that the loose watery envelope which covers a large portion of the

world was set in motion, and sweeping over the land drowned and then buried deep in gravel, loam, and clay hecatombs of human beings, a vast cemetery of life, causing a deluge apparently unparalleled in extent and completeness in any other geological period; a catastrophe which may well claim, therefore, to be spoken of as "the great flood."

If we turn, in the next place, to the chapters dealing with the extinction of the mammoth—from which, incorrectly enough, the whole work derives its name—we shall find that fascinating romance re-told in minute detail, from the first discovery of a few tusks and teeth to the disinterment of whole carcases. We would fain linger over the curious learning amassed in the first chapter, where Mr. Howorth shows, by quotations from early travellers, that the words 'mammoth' and 'behemoth' are identical, the former being merely a Russian corruption of the latter, applied in very ancient times by Arab traders to huge bones-probably those of extinct elephants—which were shown to them in Tartary; that the griffon-both classical and mediæval-may be identified with an extinct rhinoceros (R. tichorinus), a contemporary of the mammoth, between whose skull and that of a bird a fanciful resemblance may be traced, and whose horns were believed to be its claws; that the classical fable of the griffon guarding gold was suggested by the fact that gold-seekers in Western Siberia laid bare the bones of huge extinct animals, the elephant and the rhinoceros, in the course of their excavations; and, finally, that the bones of giants, so common in mediæval legends, were only those of mammoths. But in treating of the mammoth truth is stranger than legend. the seventeenth century the Russians began to obtain ivory from Northern Siberia, sometimes in the form of whole tusks, but more frequently worked by the natives into snuff-boxes, combs, and other objects. The mystery which attended this supply tempted adventurous explorers to investigate the sources of it, and about the middle of the last century a Russian merchant, named Liachof, discovered the island, which now bears his name, off the mouth of the Lena. There, when the sun melted the ice, he found vast heaps of tusks and bones of mammoths. The ivory was often, we are told, as fresh and white as that from Africa. Liachof was engaged for many years in digging ivory there, and on the neighbouring islands, which, since his time, have yielded an almost incredible amount of tusks. It is impossible to form any estimate of the quantity found during the years immediately succeeding the first discovery; but it has been computed that

has well be otice dred the

Oct.

on.

ntly

om-

the

n or

ints

vhich very ophe l the loam anied which itions ained when which olithic robaces as egins. erable plants been world swept ecially maller recent well as o have ch the

over a

cation of the

3/1 184

11

tl

ne

de

W

qu

m

pa

WE

fro

he

ha

déb

thi

tati

lar

it a

mu

trit

que

in 1

during the last twenty years the tusks of twenty thousand mammoths have been exported from a very limited area, nor has any diminution in the supply been as yet observed. This estimate, it should be remarked, takes no account of the number exported to China, where ivory from this source was utilised from a very early period.

But it must not be supposed that mammoth remains are confined to the islands off the Siberian coast. The whole northern sea-board of Asia, from Behring's Straits to the Ural Mountains, is rich in them. They are found not only on the banks of the long rivers and in their deltas, but perhaps even more abundantly on the very short rivers which fall into the Arctic Sea. Nor are they confined to the beds or banks of rivers. They occur in nearly all parts of the *tundra*, or flat, moss-covered waste, which forms the northern zone of Siberia. The traveller Wrangell says:

'The best mammoth bones, as well as the greatest number, are found at a certain depth below the surface, usually in clay hills, more rarely in black earth. The more solid the clay the better the bones are preserved. Experience has also shown that more are found in elevations situated near higher hills than along the low coast or on the flat tundra.'

Nor are bones only disinterred. The discovery of entire carcases, both of the mammoth and the rhinoceros, has been repeatedly recorded; and, as Mr. Howorth observes, these probably do not represent a tithe of those about which the natives have preserved a discreet silence. When extracted from the frozen earth the skin, covered with wool and long hair, is usually intact, as are the ears and trunk, while the flesh is as fresh as if recently taken out of an Esquimaux cache or a Yakut subterranean meat-safe. In several cases both skeletons and carcases have been found standing upright in the ground, as though they had sunk down into soft earth while yet alive, and been buried in that position. Further, the curious fact has been noted that a large number had their heads turned towards the north.

It is not surprising that these marvellous discoveries should have given rise to several theories to account for the remains of such huge animals being deposited under conditions so unusual. It was suggested in the first place that they had floated down the rivers from a country where the climate was less severe. But, as Sir Richard Owen pointed out long ago, 'the bones exhibit no marks of detrition; their ridges, their apophyses, are in perfect preservation;' and, it might be added, how could carcases float down rocky streams

such as the Yenissei, for hundreds of miles, and retain not sand only their flesh but their long hair? Again, the remains are nor more plentiful on the tundra than in or near the rivers; they This the are found not only in rivers flowing towards the north, but in was those that flow in the opposite direction; and, most fatal fact of all for the acceptance of this theory, not only do they beare come less plentiful the farther we advance towards the south, hole but the mammoths found in southern localities can be sepa-Ural rated specifically from those which are so plentiful in the the north. A second theory invokes seasonal migrations. Beeven cause certain circum-polar animals are in the habit of migratthe ing to fresh feeding-grounds in summer and winter, it has been argued that the mammoth and the rhinoceros did likéwise, passing their summers in the north and their winters in the south. To this theory Mr. Howorth makes the following reply:-

> 'In the first place, it must be remembered that the question is not so much one of climate as of food. There is nothing here for these great beasts to eat in the summer, for they cannot browse like reindeer on tundra mosses and grasses. In summer no less than in winter, the district where the mammoth remains chiefly abound is quite unsuited to their mode of feeding, and neither in quantity nor in quality of food could they have supplied their wants. For we must remember it is not a question of finding food for a sporadic pachyderm or two, but for enormous herds, whose hecatombs are buried there. Again, if we consider the configuration of Siberia, and the vast distances over which this migration would have to pass, we shall come to but one conclusion. Where could the mammoths from Kamschatka, or the banks of the Kolyma, or the islands of New Siberia, migrate to to gain a favourable wintering station?

'But we may go further. If the mammoth migrated in large herds with his young ones for a summer jaunt to the Arctic Sea, it is hardly credible that he should take with him, stored up in his paunch, a sufficient store of food to last him while there. We know the kind of food he and the rhinoceros fed upon, and we have the actual débris of their food forthcoming from the recesses of their teeth, and this food is not now found along the Arctic Sea, or in Chukchi land, or in New Siberia. This is a crucial test. While this kind of vegetation is not now found growing there, debris of a similar kind is largely found in the same beds as the mammoth remains, and with it also a large assemblage of helices, and other land shells, now living much farther south. . . . Plants and snails cannot migrate. They must stay the winter through ' (p. 621).

The molar teeth of the mammoth exhibit a succession of triturating surfaces placed close together, and the tusks, frequently of enormous size, extended laterally, like two scythes, in the same horizontal plane, with a contour of fully three-

s of flat, eria. r, are more

ones

nd in

Oct.

or on carbeen these h the acted long e the

naux cases right earth rther, their

veries or the ondie that re the inted their ind, it reams

to

in be

cl

of

an

TI

co

do

ob

Pa

ve

CO

rh

no

sa

tio

ası

ha

cei

an

up

tio

OCC

'th

wile

hig

occ

vict

con

ove by 1

and

be

exte

dist

bur

quarters of a circle. The former would be as admirably adapted for crushing twigs of soft-wooded conifers, as the latter for catching and holding down top-branches while they were being stripped by the trunk. Further, the wool and long hair with which the mammoth was covered would render him less accessible to cold than his Indian or African half-brother at the present day. That the sterile wastes of Northern Siberia, swept by icy tempests, and enlivened by nothing save a few hardy flowers during the so-called summer, once possessed the conditions for life indicated by these peculiarities, has been amply proved by the researches of more than one competent naturalist. In many places large birch-trees have been found, complete with bark, branches, and roots; in others large stems, with their roots fast in the soil; while the deposits in which the carcases occur consist generally of clay alternating with layers of vegetable matter-mosses, grasses, roots, leaves, and pieces of branches. The natives recognize this wood as indigenous, and call it Adam's wood (Adamovshtshina) in contrast to Noashina, or drift-wood. evidence indicates that the flora of the district resembled that of Southern Siberia at the present time; that it was wellwooded; that the limit of the woods extended far to the north of their present range; that the winters were temperate and not Arctic.

In striking contrast to the conditions which once prevailed, the ground is now so completely frozen that it has been calculated that boring must be carried to a depth of 630 feet before water can be found in a fluid state. This fact being ascertained, we need not marvel that buried flesh should remain undecayed; but we are led to an important corollary, namely, 'that the bodies of mammoths and other animals entombed in it must have been frozen immediately after death, and have remained frozen since they were first entombed '(p. 93). This corollary is formulated, in almost identical language, by Lyell himself, and also by Buckland and Cuvier.

Up to this point Mr. Howorth is at one with previous writers; but, when he propounds a theory of causation, he widely differs from most of them. He maintains—and so far his position is unassailable—that it would be unreasonable to postulate as many catastrophes as there are skeletons, and that we have to seek for 'some catastrophe which operated over a wide area, and not through the slow processes of the ordinary struggles for existence.' Here, however, he shall express his favourite theory in his own words:—

'We want a cause that should kill the animals, and yet not break to pieces their bodies, or even mutilate them, a cause which would in some cases disintegrate the skeletons without weathering the bones. We want a cause that would not merely do this as a widespread murrain or plague might, but one which would bury the bodies as well as kill the animals, which could take up gravel and clay and lay them down again, and which could sweep together animals of different sizes and species, and mix them with trees and other débris of vegetation. What cause competent to do this is known to us, except rushing waters on a great scale? Water would drown the animals, and yet would not mutilate the bodies. It would kill them all with complete impartiality, irrespective of their strength, age, or size. It would take up clay and earth, and cover the bodies with it. This is the very work it is doing daily on a small scale. Not only could it do this, but it is the only cause known to me capable of doing the work on a scale commensurate with the effects we see in Siberia' (p. 184).

In support of this theory Mr. Howorth aptly cites the observations of Professor Brandt on the rhinoceros found by Pallas. That distinguished naturalist states that 'the bloodvessels, and even the finer capillaries, were filled with brown coagulated blood.' Von Schrenk also examined another rhinoceros, discovered under similar conditions, and found the nostrils wide open and the mouth partly open, whence, he says, 'it may be concluded that the animal died from suffocation, which it tried to avoid by keeping the nostrils wide asunder.' These appearances unquestionably point to death having been caused by asphyxia. Again, the position of certain skeletons is cited as a further proof; for instance, an example quoted by Cuvier, where an elephant was 'rolled up with its tusks between its hind legs' (p. 187). To the action of a great flood moreover Mr. Howorth attributes the occurrence (not in Siberia, but elsewhere) of

'those immense caches in which the remains of many species of wild animals are incongruously mixed together, pell-mell, often on high ground, a position which is paralleled by the great floods which occur occasionally in the tropics, where we find the tiger and its victims all collecting together on some dry place, and reduced to a common condition of timidity and helplessness by a flood which has overwhelmed the flat country. In the present case all were overtaken by the water, tossed and tumbled together in a common destruction, and then covered thickly with a mantle of clay or gravel—a mantle, be it remembered, spread over immense areas, without a break external or internal, and in which we can find no traces of local disturbance, such as would be caused by any process of subsequent burying, and showing that bones and covering were laid down together ' (p. 186).

ably atter were long him other thern save posrities, n one have ; in e the

Oct.

This d that well-o the perate

f clay

asses, gnize

railed, n calet bebeing ild reollary, als endeath, nbed' al lanvier. evious on, he and so onable is, and

erated

of the

e shall

I

W

CI

th

aı

ai

of

W

th

sta

ab

fli

ele

ha

ha

tic

va

ex

riv

CO

tio

wa

of

are

as

a

sho

fav

the

like

dis

ap

one

in v

gor

has

of !

tho

to 1

with

been

have

tion

Lastly, as regards Siberia, Mr. Howorth cites the weighty authority of the distinguished traveller and geologist Erman, who concludes that the strata near Yakutsk 'have been deposited from waters which at one time, and it may be presumed suddenly, overflowed the whole country as far as the Polar Sea;' and in a subsequent passage, where he is describing the islands called New Siberia, he points to the wild disorder of the trees and bones on the summits of the hills as a proof that these islands 'opposed the last bar to the diffusion of the waters,' which, in his opinion, poured over the country from the south.

Mr. Howorth has allowed his narrative of the extinction of the mammoth and its companions to occupy 191 pages out of the whole 464 contained in his volume, and it is evident that he intended his peculiar theory to be fully set forth in what may be justly termed this elaborate monograph. We have therefore followed in his steps, and have given as detailed an analysis of it as our space would admit. In consequence we shall be obliged to pass somewhat hastily over the other divisions of his treatise.

The subject next undertaken is 'the evidence of the caves and fissures in the Old World.' These have been divided by their explorers into three classes: (1) those containing skeletons and ungnawed bones; (2) those which were evidently the dens of carnivorous mammals; (3) those which served for human habitations. The remains found in caves of the first class must have belonged either to animals who came into them to die, or were brought into them by some other agency. Now, when it is remembered that bones of animals so diverse as elephant, rhinoceros, hippopotamus, ox, deer, horse, beaver, otter, rabbit and other rodents, bear, hyena, wolf, lion, are frequently found together in the same cave, it is incredible that they should all belong to animals who died there. It is not the custom of many of the above-mentioned animals to slink into caves to die; and, even if it were, they would hardly have taken their young with them-and the bones of young animals are frequently found mixed up with those of Nor can the agency of beasts of prey be invoked, for, as stated above, the bones are always ungnawed, and sometimes undisturbed-in other words, the bones of an entire skeleton have been found, still preserving their natural relations to each other. As regards the caves of the second class, no one has ever questioned the fact that the animals to which the bones there found belonged 'were dragged into them

1 The italics are Mr. Howorth's, not ours.

eighty

rman,

en de-

sumed

Sea:'1

slands

of the

f that

of the

from

nction

es out

vident

orth in

etailed

quence

other

e caves

ded by

skele-

idently

ved for

he first

ne into

agency.

diverse

beaver,

on, are

credible

animals

would

ones of

hose of

ked, for,

d some-

n entire

ral rela-

nd class,

o which

o them

We

whole or piece-meal, and there devoured and their bones crushed' (p. 201); but the position of the bones in some of them has been thought to indicate that they have been rearranged since the animals left them. The same appearances are found, most unmistakeably, in caves of the third class, many of which have been used-of course not simultaneously-by man and by carnivorous mammals. A cave in Belgium, which had once served for human habitation, was examined by the well-known naturalist Professor Van Beneden, who found in it as many as thirteen skeletons, but 'in an inconceivable state of disorder' ('dans un état de désordre à peine croyable'); and in another, in Sicily, Dr. Falconer found ashes and flint implements imbedded in a breccia containing bones of elephant, hyena, bear, and lion. A similar confusion of bones has been observed in fissures, notably in those of Malta, which have been submitted to a very close and searching examination by Dr. Leith Adams. Various theories have been advanced to account for the above phenomena, and most caveexplorers have postulated the introduction of water-say a river or a land-flood—as being the only agent which would account for the peculiar position of the bones—their accumulation in the narrowest passages, and at points where the stream was arrested by a current or an obstacle, and the deposition of the larger pieces in such a direction that their largest axes are parallel to the walls of the cave or fissure. Mr. Howorth, as might be expected, goes far beyond the modest theories of a Gaudry or a Boyd Dawkins. Nothing will satisfy him short of the Great Flood, and we admit that he supports his favourite theory by two very weighty considerations, first that the contents of the caves are covered with a diluvium precisely like that which is spread over hill and dale in the adjoining districts; and secondly, that the stalagmitic floor 'separates a period of profuse life from one when life was very scanty, one in which certain animals now extinct abounded from one in which they completely disappeared' (p. 211).

The evidence afforded by human remains (in which category we include all articles indicative of human workmanship) has been marshalled very skilfully by Mr. Howorth in support of his theory, and we specially commend to the attention of those who may take up his book with neither wish nor leisure to read the whole of it, the chapter (the ninth) which deals with this subject. The traces of prehistoric man which have been gradually coming to light during the past half-century have naturally been submitted to the most critical examination; and the evidence has been received with a caution

which, considering the momentous issues involved, can hardly be thought excessive. That man should have been the contemporary of the cave-animals was thought at first to be simply incredible; and so long as the evidence was confined to one district, or consisted of a few flints that might have been fashioned by other agencies than human hands, doubt was not merely natural, but justifiable. Gradually, however, as the evidence became overwhelming, even the most sceptical were convinced, and before long it became possible to separate the objects discovered into two broad divisions, the palæolithic and the neolithic, and the human beings who fashioned them into palæolithic and neolithic men. This distinction has now been universally admitted, and it is not difficult to enumerate the chief characteristics of each. The former dwelt in caves, procured their food by the chase, had no domestic animals, and used weapons of unpolished flint. Yet some of the articles made by them—such as their bone harpoons-show considerable ingenuity, and their artistic sense was strong enough to enable them to draw pictures of animals which are at least recognizable. Neolithic man, on the other hand, lived on rudely fortified heights, had domesticated animals, used weapons of polished flint, and was, in general, a well-to-do, comfortable person, who did not trouble himself about the arts. As Mr. Howorth says, translating M. de Mortillet-

'in the former period we have a uniform type of man; in the latter, one showing great diversity. In the former, a nomadic population; in the latter, a sedentary one. In the former, a race of hunters and fishermen, without agriculture; in the latter, agriculture well developed. In the former, no monuments, and no traces of sepulture; in the latter, abundance of both' (p. 247).

It is conceivable that this latter state of things might have been developed out of the former, but there is a concurrence of opinion among the best judges that such was not the case. There are no transitional forms, and nowhere has any well-certified instance been met with in which the remains have been found mixed. This is not Mr. Howorth's own opinion; it is a statement which depends on the authorities whom he quotes, and it is indeed 'a startling fact,' as he calls it, 'that the two sets of men, their remains, and their animal companions are sharply and definitely separated by a complete gap' (p. 246). On this subject there is no higher authority than Professor Boyd Dawkins. He is no friend to Mr. Howorth's theory, and yet he can express himself in the following terms. After pointing out that the mammoth and

it:

18

wh Th newill will life from

Mi

me

by Bo will a fi anii 'for biol hist

aga

con

side

be o

we need Am
the Alasi cond found dition ment probareceives

most allied

fresh

speak

its companions were unknown in Britain in the neolithic age, he proceeds:—

'Speaking in general terms, the wild fauna of Europe, as we have it now, dates from the beginning of the prehistoric age, and consists merely of those animals which were able to survive the changes by which their pleistocene congeners were banished or destroyed. The survival of the domestic animals under the care of man in the neolithic age, and their extension over the whole of Europe in a wild or semi-wild state, coupled with the disappearance of the wild species mentioned above, constitutes a change in the mammal life at least as important as any of those which define the miocene from the pliocene, or the pliocene from the pleistocene periods.' 1

These are strong words, and we are not surprised that Mr. Howorth should quote them approvingly. But he and their author view the same facts from standpoints separated by so wide a gulf that no bridge can span it. Professor Boyd Dawkins postulates a gradual extinction; Mr. Howorth will be content with nothing short of a sudden cataclysm—a flood of waters which passed over the land, drowning the animals and then burying their remains—a catastrophe which 'forms a great break in human continuity no less than in the biological records of animal life, and is the Great Divide where history really begins' (p. 256).

This interesting chapter closes the case for the petitioner against the doctrine of uniformity so far as the Old World is concerned. In the four following the evidence on the same side from the New World is laid before us. This, as might be expected, does not differ in its main features from what we have been already made familiar with, and therefore it need not be examined in detail. Beginning with North

America Mr. Howorth argues that

'the remains of the mammoth and its companions are found in Alaska, and as far north as Point Barrow, under the same wintry conditions that they occur in in Asia. As in that continent they are found imbedded in frozen soil, which, on account of their fresh condition, must have remained frozen from the time of their entombment. And although no actual mummies have occurred, this is probably due to the slight exploration which the country has as yet received; but the remains in Alaska have been found in a singularly fresh condition, and the explorers of the cliffs at Eschcholz Bay speak of the strong smell of decaying animal matter there' (p. 266).

Among the companions of the mammoth in America the most interesting and important is the mastodon, a closely allied form, which in Europe belongs to a more ancient

s, the s who is disis not The chase, dished s their artistic ures of an, on

Oct.

ardly

con-

o be

fined

have

doubt

vever,

ptical

sepa-

e latter, ulation; ters and well deoulture;

lomes-

vas, in

rouble

slating

ht have urrence he case, by well-his have pinion; hom he fit, 'that al compomplete uthority to Mr. If in the noth and

¹ Cave Hunting, by W. Boyd Dawkins, p. 266.

geological period. In America, on the contrary, its remains. as Sir Charles Lyell has pointed out, are 'not unfrequently met with in bogs and lacustrine deposits formed in hollows in the drift, and, therefore, in a geological position much resembling that of recent peat and shell-marl in the British Isles, Denmark, or the valley of the Somme. entire skeletons have been discovered within a few feet of the surface.' Mr. Howorth relates at length the discovery of several of these, which bear a remarkable analogy to the mammoth-mummies of Siberia. Their hair, skin, and flesh, it is true, have not been preserved, but beneath the ribs have been found, in several instances, a mass of twigs and other vegetable matter—evidently the contents of the stomach. This fact shows that the skeletons rest where the animals died; and, as in Siberia, full-grown, half-grown, and young animals are found lying together. They occur at different depths—sometimes in surface soil, sometimes buried deep in marl or gravel; sometimes with the fore legs extended and the hind legs drawn under the body, as though the animal had been overwhelmed while swimming; and sometimes in a vertical position. Moreover, it has been observed that, like the mammoth, the skeletons lie in a definite direction, usually south-west and north-east. Here, as in Siberia, we are evidently in presence of a great catastrophe, which appears, so far as the phenomena can be interpreted, to have overwhelmed an entire race, old and young together. Such, at any rate, is the opinion of competent American naturalists who have specially examined the mastodon remains.

The analogy between the phenomena presented by North America and Europe has been further strengthened by the discovery of human remains in similar situations, and associated with the remains of a similar mammalian fauna. Indications of the former existence of palæolithic man are by no means so abundant in America as they are in Europe; still, enough have been discovered to justify the conclusion that 'man has left his remains in America, as in the Old World, in beds of distinctly pleistocene age.' The beds here referred to are river-gravels of great depth, in which, and occasionally 'under the great boulders which pervade them,' palæolithic flints have been found. Here, again, the existence of the gap noticed above between palæolithic and neolithic man in Europe may be recognized. As a careful and unbiassed observer, frequently quoted by Mr. Howorth, has recorded:

1 Lyell, Antiquity of Man, ed. 1863, p. 352.

ra gi va wil the ag de

gre

by

to

aı

ne

pl

The in the anii as man soo old been may of 1

has

cont facts down destr tainin num at the the a (p. 3)

mam to ju comp breal

vo

MILIN

Oct.

ains,

ently

lows

nuch

ritish

imes

of the

ry of

the

flesh,

have

other

mach.

imals

roung

ferent

ep in

d and

nimal

es in a

t, like

sually

re evi-

so far

ned an

is the

ecially

North

by the s, and

fauna.

are by

urope;

clusion

he Old

ds here

ch, and

e them,

xistence

eolithic

and un-

rth, has

'It is not practicable to trace any connection between the characteristic chipped palæolithic implements and the polished, pecked, and finely-wrought objects of Indian origin, the one form certainly not having any necessary connection with the other.' ¹

South America offers a still more remarkable series of phenomena, which may with still greater certitude be referred to the action of water on a great scale. In the plains of the Pampas there are found buried quadrupeds, usually of gigantic size-elephants, sloths, and armadillos-in such vast quantities that it has been estimated that any line whatever drawn across that territory would probably cross the skeleton of some extinct animal. All observers are agreed that they and the strata in which they lie have been deposited together. The bones are evidently of no very great antiquity. Darwin remarked of specimens discovered by himself that they appeared 'so fresh that it is difficult to believe that they have lain buried for ages underground. The bone contains so much animal matter that when heated in the flame of a spirit-lamp it not only exhales a very strong animal odour, but likewise burns with a slight flame;' and, as with the Siberian mammoth and the North American mastodon, there is little doubt that the animals were buried soon after death. Moreover, here as elsewhere, young and old lie side by side, and animals the most incongruous have been overwhelmed by the common destruction, whatever it may have been. That it was an inundation was the opinion of M. d'Orbigny, than whom no one, not even Mr. Darwin, has studied South America more laboriously. He says:-

'I argue that this destruction was caused by an invasion of the continent by water, a view which is completely en rapport with the facts presented by the great Pampian deposit, which was clearly laid down by water. How otherwise can we account for this complete destruction, and the homogeneousness of the Pampas deposits containing bones? I find an evident proof of this in the immense number of bones and of entire animals, whose numbers are greatest at the outlets of the valleys, as Mr. Darwin shows. This proves that the animals were floated, and hence were chiefly carried to the coast' (p. 352).

Human remains undoubtedly associated with these great mammals are extremely rare; but enough have been found to justify Mr. Howorth in claiming palæolithic man for their companion, and in establishing here, as elsewhere, a decisive break between him and the tribes of living Indians.

From South America Mr. Howorth turns to Australia and

¹ Abbott, Primitive Industry, p. 512.

VOL. XXVII.- NO. LIII.

f

ti

C

m

OI

re

th

of

no

m

ne

wi

the

rep

pu

pos

to

lea

cee

evic

ear

land

fend

rese

for ·

it se

thin

insta

all a

which

anin

anim

of c

New Zealand, where, in the destruction of the great marsupials, and the struthious birds called Dinornis, or by the natives moa, he finds fresh confirmation of his theory. evidence respecting the marsupials is scanty, and to our minds inconclusive; but respecting the moa there is no lack of in-That it survived down to the occupation of the country by the Maoris, and that they completed its extirpation, there can be no doubt. The evidence of Maori tradition is overwhelming, and Mr. Howorth frankly accepts it. But, besides the Maoris, other and more primitive savages hunted the moa, as is evidenced by the traces of their camp fires, where they roasted the flesh of the birds they had succeeded in killing, and by their rude weapons, of which considerable numbers have been discovered. Those who examined the New Zealand court of the Colonial Exhibition in detail will remember the extensive series of these, got together by the care and skill of the late Sir Julius von Haast, to whom we owe much of our knowledge respecting the different species of moa, and of all that relates to its persecution and final This part of the moa's history, however, is a extinction. mere episode, from Mr. Howorth's point of view. The deposits of moa bones connected with this later period have but little interest for him. He is more concerned with those localities in which the bones occur in vast heterogeneous masses, various genera and species mixed together, and commingled with the remains of other birds now extinct. One of these, at a place called Glenmark, was covered by sixty feet of river shingle. It was computed that the number of specimens there imbedded must have reached a thousand, if not more, and they were of all ages, from the chick to the adult. The description of one of these masses is the description of all. None of the bones are weathered, or gnawed by animals, or broken into by savages. To what cause, then, are we to ascribe the remarkable conditions under which they are found? Fire in the forest, a poisoned spring, an entanglement in a morass, are examined in turn, and dismissed as inadequate. In fact the New Zealand explorers who had the benefit of studying the whole problem on the spot, are as much puzzled as those who only read accounts of it. To Mr. Howorth it seems

'that these facts are consistent only with the same theory which I have quoted to account for the caches, and similar deposits of heterogeneous bones in Europe, Asia, and America, namely, the animals being overtaken in some place of vantage by a sudden and transitory wave of water, which drowned the creatures in situ, but did not disperse or triturate their bones, or mix them with extraneous débris' (p. 409).

Oct.

ırsu-

the

The

inds

f in-

the

irpa-

tra-

ts it. rages

camp

suc-

sider-

nined

detail

er by

vhom

pecies

final

is a

posits

little

alities

arious

th the

place

ingle.

edded

ere of

of one

bones

to by

mark-

in the

ss, are

Mr. Howorth keeps very properly to the last 'the evidence of human tradition.' In a final chapter he shows that a vast number of native legends and traditions start with a great flood. Beginning with the Bible, he traces it through the early Hindus, the Greeks, the Norsemen, the Chinese, the Esquimaux, the Mexicans and Peruvians, the Caribs, the Polynesians, the Fiji Islanders, the Australians, and others. These tribes are, in his view, the descendants of 'a once continuous community broken asunder by some great disintegrating cause.' If this were so, the continuous community in question must have embraced some strangely divergent elements. which mere considerations of climate and surroundings are surely insufficient to account for.

Again, we have seen how strongly Mr. Howorth insists on the gap between palæolithic and neolithic man-that relics of the one race are never found mixed with those of the other, &c. But from what source could the descendants of his 'once continuous community' derive their customs, if not from their own ancestors, that is to say, from palæolithic men of some sort? If, on the other hand, he postulates a new creation for neolithic man, he finds himself at variance with the human traditions he invokes, for they all provide for the escape of a chosen few 'to increase and multiply and

replenish the earth.'

It often happens that those who write a book with a purpose achieve some other end than that which they proposed to themselves when they started. Mr. Howorth intended to overthrow the theory of Uniformity, but to our minds he leaves that theory very much where he found it, and has succeeded only in bringing together a very remarkable catena of evidence in favour of a Great Flood in various portions of the The theory is not new. It formed the basis of Buckland's Relliquiæ Diluvianæ, published in 1823. It was defended by Professor Sedgwick in 1825. But it has been reserved for Mr. Howorth to state it with a fulness of research for which the older geologists had no materials. At first sight it seems to fit the facts very neatly; but, when we come to think it over, various difficulties present themselves. instance, if the mammoths now found in Siberian drifts were placed there by this flood, they must, we suppose, have been all alive when it took place. What, then, has become of those which died previously? We are aware that bodies of wild animals that have died a natural death are rare; still, such animals do die, and their remains ought not to be left out of consideration. On the other hand, was Siberia large

act the ng the those ns which I heteroanimals ansitory did not débris'

enough to contain the myriads whose bones are now buried in its soil, supposing them to have been all alive together? Again, are we to suppose that the floods of which we have been tracing the effects were all simultaneous? Did they sweep over the whole country, or only over a portion of The Pampas, for instance, are only a small portion of South America, and while they were being formed, what was going on in the adjoining territories? If we understand Uniformity aright, the distinguished geologist who propounded it taught that the causes which had moulded the earth's surface had always been the same in kind as at the present time, though not in degree. His theory does not exclude cataclysmic actions of various kinds: volcanic eruptions, floods, upheaval and subsidence of land, and the like. Many of the cataclysms which he chronicles would, if space enough be assigned to them, produce the effects Mr. Howorth requires. For instance, the eruption of Skaptár Jokull in Iceland, which began in 1792, and lasted for two years, is said to have destroyed more than 0,000 human beings, besides overwhelming with lava, or drowning with water, large tracts of country. Had a herd of mammoths come in the way of so violent a cataclysm, it would have made short work of them.

Mr. Howorth promises us a second volume at no distant date, which shall deal with the peculiarly geological side of the problem. We shall await this with impatience, and read it with attention; but, as a preliminary exercise, we strongly recommend to him the immediate withdrawal from circulation of the work before us, and its re-issue in a form better calculated to impress the public favourably. At present it is far too long; too full of irrelevant matter; too carelessly put together; and written in a style which is never clear, and often ungrammatical. There is no index; no list of authorities quoted; and the references are made so clumsily that it is frequently difficult, if not impossible, to discover what work is being cited. It is unsatisfactory to find 'Op. cit.' at the bottom of a page, and then, after a long search, to discover that the full title has never once been given. Moreover, the typographical blunders are simply innumerable. It is not too much to say that hardly a single quotation is given accurately, while in some, as, for instance, in the lines from Lucretius prefixed to the ninth chapter, the blunders deserve a punishment which we regret to learn is being given up for such offences even at our public schools. Sir Galahad ought to have more self-respect than to go forth to battle with his armour unpolished and his accoutrements in disorder.

m do an for dis

the

tra

C

ci

in

ni

in

be

W

kn is : cre p. : alo pos effe is i

gec

of]

A

CON of an even which Oct.

ried

ner?

nave

they

n of

n of

was

tand

pro-

l the

t the

not

erup-

like.

pace

vorth

Ice-

id to

over-

cts of

of so

em.

stant

de of

read

ongly

ation

calcu-

is far

y put c, and authothat it work at the scover

er, the

ot too

s pre-

hment fences

more

ır un-

But, after all allowances have been made, we repeat, in conclusion, that Mr. Howorth's volume should be welcomed with respect by believers, on account of the undesigned coincidence between his researches and the narrative of the Flood in the Book of Genesis. There was a time when the Word of God and the results of science were supposed to be antagonistic; when religious men even went so far as to refuse to look into what Professor Sedgwick used to call 'the other volume,' because they feared that it might unsettle their faith. There was a time, too, when a Burnet or a Woodward-and we might almost add a Buckland-imagined that they were doing God service by taking Genesis for their starting-point, and straining the observed facts to make them fit the dogma for which they held a brief, in a way that was little short of Mr. Howorth has taken a very different course. He has said no word about the religious question; he puts the Biblical account of the Flood on the same level as the traditions of the Polynesians and the Esquimaux; for all we know to the contrary, he may even be an agnostic—though it is scarcely an agnostic tenet to consider it 'irrational to refuse credence to a story because it is contained in the Bible' (Pref. p. x.). He has viewed the facts from the scientific standpoint alone, and from that standpoint he finds himself compelled to postulate a Great Flood as the only agent capable of producing effects observed in all regions of the world. The conclusion Nature, though she may be 'red in tooth and is irresistible. claw with ravine,' does not shriek against our creed; and geology, if its records be read aright, becomes the handmaid of Revealed Truth.

ART. VI.—TRUTHFULNESS IN SCIENCE AND RELIGION.

Science and the Bishops. (Nineteenth Century, November.)
By Professor Huxley. (London, 1887.)

CONTROVERSIES which on a hasty glance seem to be merely of an ephemeral character are very often found to involve and even to imperil principles and verities of the greatest value, which cannot be too often asserted or too vigorously defended.

It is on this ground we proceed to consider, somewhat tardily, an Article in the *Nineteenth Century* of last year, which we think furnishes ample illustration of the truth of what we

have been saying.

Setting aside the part of Professor Huxley's article which is of a personal character, its general teaching seems to be epitomised in three passages. At all events, these passages are so full of meaning and hang so closely together that they are well worth considering by themselves.

The first is an assertion of the principle that science and

theology cannot be kept apart:--

'There is another portion of the Bishop of Bedford's sermon which I think will be warmly appreciated by all honest and clear-headed men. He repudiates the view of those who say that theology and science occupy wholly different spheres and need in no way intermeddle with each other '(p. 627).

The second is a claim on the part of men of science to set as high a alue as any one upon the spiritual elements of the Christian faith.

'It does not appear to have entered the imaginations of these people that outside their pale, and firmly resolved never to enter it, there are thousands of men, certainly not their inferiors in character, capacity, or knowledge of the questions at issue, who estimate those purely spiritual elements of the Christian faith, of which the Bishop of Manchester speaks, as highly as the Bishop does, but who will have nothing to do with the Christian Churches because in their apprehension, and for them, the profession of belief in the miraculous, on the evidence offered, would be simply immoral' (p. 632).

The third is an indictment of the unscientific character of the evidence for the Christian miracles.

'I do not know of any body of scientific men who could be got to listen without the strongest expressions of disgusted repudiation to the exposition of a pretended scientific discovery, which had no better evidence to show for itself than the story of the devils entering a herd of swine, or of the fig-tree which was blasted for bearing no figs when it was not the season of figs '(p. 632).

Professor Huxley appends a prophecy and an imputation. The prophecy is as follows:—

'I venture to warn this preacher, and those, who, with him, persist in identifying Christianity with the miraculous, that such forms of Christianity are not only doomed to fall to the ground, but that, within the last half-century, they have been driving that way with continually accelerated velocity' (p. 631).

ju su th

no

st

ti

to

g

th we no be

whof the ad:

the

not bet life int

An stroreli star wh but

tha

/1.10.A

The imputation (justly so described on account of the comparison implied in its concluding words) is this:—

'There is one moral benefit which the pursuit of science unquestionably bestows. It keeps the estimate of the value of evidence up to the proper mark; and we are constantly receiving lessons, and sometimes very sharp ones, on the nature of proof. Men of science will always act up to their standard of veracity when mankind in general leave off sinning: but that standard appears to me to be higher among them than in any other class of the community' (p. 632).

Some of us do not believe in this prophecy nor admit the justice of this imputation. We think that Christianity will survive, and survive in a miraculous form; and we hold that those who believe in a miraculous form of Christianity are not for that reasen liable to the imputation of using a lower standard of veracity than men of science. It is for the purpose of justifying these opinions that we propose to examine the three texts above quoted from Professor Huxley: it being well understood that he is only responsible for the texts, and not at all for the expositions, the correctness of which must be left to the judgment of the reader.

It would be an unheard-of thing to expound a text which was not accepted as true; and Professor Huxley's three propositions appear to us all perfectly true. Science and theology cannot be severed; and multitudes of scientific men, while rejecting the miraculous, accept the spiritual elements of Christian faith: the evidence upon which the miracles of the New Testament are received is such as could not be admitted for scientific purposes, and the most convinced Christian would probably be greatly taken aback if he saw them recognized as data in a scientific treatise. The question, then, is not whether these propositions are true, but what they mean.

I. The impossibility of severing science and theology does not depend upon an identity either of subject or method between the two pursuits. Science can be separated from life and from personal intercourse. Theology in its very name introduces us to personal communion with a living Being. And this connexion between theology and life appears more strongly still when we consider the relations of theology with religion; how useless and objectless it seems unless it is constantly used for religious purposes; and how the Bible, from which our theology must be taken, is not a book of science, but of religious life. Now, nothing can be more different than the attitudes of mind which are assumed in science and

they e and

Oct.

dily,

n we

hich

o be •

sages *

ermon clearcology ay in-

nce to ments

these nter it, racter, those Bishop no will n their culous,

cter of

uld be epudiach had rils enbearing

tation.

persist forms of at that, ay with

in religion. In science (by which we are here to understand physical science) the mind observes, registers, and classifies phenomena. In religion it thinks, feels, and wills. The man of science notes and records his facts. Those which offer themselves most readily to his purpose are found in what we call the material world; and there is a tendency in science to make as much of this class of facts as possible. But we need lay no stress upon this point. There is no reason why facts other than those of matter and motion should not be deemed physical facts and subjects of physical science, if only it be certain that they exist in nature. But the recognition of immaterial phenomena would not at all abolish the distinction between the acts of mind implied in science and in religion, or assimilate their subject matter. Religion is thinking, feeling, and willing. But even if science were to busy itself about thinking, feeling, and willing, the very attempt to consider them would show that thought as a fact subjected to the observation of science is not the same with thinking considered as the living exertion of the mind. Will, as offering itself for inquiry, is not the action of willing. And feeling, the substantive, which is the only thing that science can examine, is not feeling, the participle, which denotes, not a thing, but an act. The examinations of science must always be post mortem. Even if the same person furnishes the mental phenomena to be studied, and himself conducts the study, he can never catch the mental action as an action. When he runs round to that end of the glass to which he must apply his eye he ipso facto vanishes from that end of the glass at which the object must be placed. He cannot be subject and object at once. Other people, indeed, he can observe while they are willing, thinking, and feeling. But then an impenetrable veil hides them from him and presents to him acts as facts—a difference which, though it be but of one letter, is immeasurable in its importance.

Let us imagine a physician in communication with a patient. He is the man of science. And first he studies the material phenomena of the case: he feels the pulse and tries the temperature. He does this part of his work with the utmost care and confidence, and very likely finds enough in it, without going further, to determine his prescription. But perhaps he does go further. He asks the patient about his feelings and experiences. But here the confidence with which he observed the material facts forsakes him, and he is cautious and distrustful. For he knows that the patient is not a man of science accustomed to note and remember facts; and even

if as as the the mi

18

fee wh wit sph the by tak

wh

reli

his

and

free inq it i know trut more that the stand been upo And ings

and off f diffe scien sequ and carri-

with

each

stand sifies man offer at we ace to need facts emed it be

Oct.

it be
f imnction
igion,
, feelabout
them
servaas the
quiry,
intive,
is not

Even to be catch o that o facto must Other

from which, in its with a les the

nking,

th the h in it,
But but his which autious a man

d even

if he were, that it is impossible for the mind to grasp feelings as felt. Even the patient can only bring them before himself as thought of or remembered, while in passing from him to the physician they lose still more of their life. And with all that he can do by observation or inquiry the man of science must confess that the feeling of his patient, as such, is in the nature of things outside of his science.

Thus if it be true that religion is an affair of thinking, feeling, and willing in the most perfect way attainable by man, while science is an affair of observing and registering facts with correctness, nothing can be more different than the two spheres; and what is it then that unites them so closely that

they cannot be severed?

There are connexions which are, as it were, accidental, vet by no means unimportant. The man of science striving to take account of all the facts and sequences of phenomena which are real and genuine is struck by the existence of religion among men as an obstinate and persistent object to his view. Scientific men have recognized this of late years, and religion as a fact in the natural history of man has been frequently treated by them as a fit and important matter of inquiry. On the other hand, religious men, whose business it is to think, feel, and will as rightly as they can, have acknowledged that they never could do so if they neglected the truths which science has brought to light; it would be immoral and irreligious to shrink from them. But these connexions are not essential. The sphere of science is so wide that no scientific man deserves his title the less for leaving the science of religion aside in his attention to other parts of the field. And though in our particular age and circumstances science forces itself upon religious people, there have been times when this was not the case; yet we look back upon those periods as displaying a peculiar purity of religion. And men of science and men of religion have entertained feelings of mutual dislike and suspicion of each other's pursuits without being thereby considered to forfeit the praise due to each in his own sphere.

But there are connexions which are absolutely essential and which must render for ever impossible the attempt to cut off from each other by a dividing wall these two domains so different in their nature and their productions. Although science considered as the observation of phenomena and their sequences is something wholly different from thinking, feeling, and willing, yet science considered as the act of observing carried on by living minds imperatively requires the whole

The difference is great. Observation is one thing, the act of observing is another; no observations help us to know what the act of observing is and how it is done, and the ideal instrument of observation would seem to be some automatic machine by which facts of all sorts should be registered without any of the failures and uncertainties which attend the use of human faculties. But as it is, observations can only be made by observing. And the science of the most rigidly scientific man is thereby brought into the same sphere of thinking, feeling, and willing to which religion belongs. It is in this way that science often becomes a kind of religion to those who follow it, both in respect of devotion and of moral They endow their science with a kind of personality and they imagine that all this emotion and moral influence is part of the science, when in reality it is the effect of science or of the pursuit of it upon powers of human nature which have no essential connexion with science. Science in itself is the same whatever the spirit in which it is pursued. When we take up a scientific book it is absolutely unknown and indifferent to us what the motives of the author were in making his observations and recording them, and what the emotions were which accompanied the task. That he had some motives and some emotions is certain, because he was not a disembodied or a self-acting intellect, but a living man. But neither of them have any business in his scientific book, and it would be excessively unscientific to give them a place in it. Whatever they be, they belong to a totally different class of literature: that which treats of feeling, thinking, and willing as living acts, not of the conditions under which they arise, or of the facts they produce. If science claims to exert a practical power over men, it is thereby claiming a kind of influence which is moral and not scientific. Its effects on man, being moral and spiritual, must be judged of by moral and spiritual, not by scientific, standards; and it must submit to be compared in respect of its practical power with other influences of a purely moral and spiritual character.

When we regard the subject from the side of religion we equally perceive the impossibility of divorcing it from science. Religion is a matter of thinking, feeling, and willing, while it hands over to science the whole body of facts. But we find that feeling, thinking, and willing are dependent upon facts. Certain conditions are necessary before these acts of the mind become possible; and when science informs us that no act of the mind can in our present life be performed without a corresponding material change in the brain, there cannot be a

doub Whe to wi His v requi renov

1888

requirement date which or fur must be w

are v

can o

ever

outsi mind our l of pe whic imag man' he w choo to ki of fa as we poun in w force imag case

man, been most ment connman, every inqui to be of or every

with

1888

thing. us to ne, and e some ould be which vations ne most sphere ngs. It gion to f moral onality ence is science which itself is When and innaking notions notives disemneither would Whatliteraling as e, or of ractical

ared in purely gion we science. while it we find n facts. ne mind o act of t a corot be a

e which

moral

ual, not

doubt that the information is of high importance to religion. When religion leads us to think about God, to love Him, and to will what He wills, it is implied that God exists, and that His will can be known to men, and these are facts. Religion requires a theology, and theology is a science which cannot renounce connexion with other sciences, or refuse to accommodate herself to them. The thinking, feeling, and willing, of which religion consists, must be attached to facts either past or future, either in heaven or earth: from facts these actions must set out, and to facts they must tend. And no fact can

be wholly withdrawn from science.

Is science then the only source of truth? The magnificence of the claim staggers us. We cannot but see that as things are we should, if left dependent on the truth which science can originate or even test, be barely furnished indeed. Whatever concerns the action of the mind in ourselves or others is outside its reach. It may lead us up to the actions of the mind, but cannot accompany us through them. The whole of our living intercourse with living men, our loves and hatreds of people, and even of things, arise independently of science, which has no methods for providing them. It is possible to imagine that science should be able from a consideration of a man's constitution and circumstances to predict exactly how he will behave; so that we should choose our friends, as we choose horses and dogs, by their points. We should be able to know what a man is and what he will do by an induction of facts, and an inference therefrom, with the same certainty as we can pronounce on the properties of a chemical compound by analysing its composition, or foretell the direction in which a stone will fall by observing its weight and the forces which bear upon it. We may choose, if we please, to imagine that a similar power of foresight would be ours in the case of man, if only we were able to observe his constitution with more accuracy. And indeed the body and the mind of man, and the social influence of men on one another, have all been claimed as subjects of scientific study; and results of the most solid value have been secured in all the three depart-But this does not tell us clearly what is the practical connexion between science and the actual life and action of man, singly or in community. Does science consider that everything in man's life and action is a proper subject of its inquiries and of its authority, and does it conceive its methods to be for every purpose the best? Does it aim at the prospect of one day giving a scientific account of every movement of every sort to which the body, soul, or mind of man is subject —the transports of the lover, the devotions of the saint, the thoughts of the poet, all alike? And does it, moreover, also hold not only that these human activities are proper subjects of scientific inquiry as to how they come to pass, but that also they all should, as far as is possible, be scientifically done: science affording not merely the account of the action, but the model method of carrying it out? Is she supreme arbitress of human life?

Now, we do not want to refuse an entrance to science anywhere throughout the whole region of matter or mind. And as all life concerns itself with matter or mind, or the relations of either to the other, it is hard to say where in all life science may not hope to find facts upon which to found her advance. Ascertained movements in the brain lead in an invariable sequence to results in the world of mind; physical changes in nature are connected by a never-failing experience with results in the feelings of human beings subjected to them. There is no limit to the discoveries in these directions which the past progress of science may lead us to expect in the future. Yet no past experience leads us to imagine that science could ever actually conquer the whole kingdom of facts concerning man, so that nothing more should be left her to explain, but the whole conditions and occasions of every part of the active life of man should be made plain to it. No rule or claim of religion, or any other power whatever, forbids science to proceed with her search and her explanations, but she herself stops short for want of power to go on. In the higher movements of the mind the experiments necessary are impossible to her, and while she knows that she could conceivably go much further in physical explanation than she has done, she confesses that the science which shall do so must be one better provided than she is.

But even if science had come to know everything which belongs to the domain of science, the larger part of human life would still remain entirely shut out from her. She would have, indeed, to confess that while she knew all the conditions of life, life in itself and in its acts was hid. Where life begins to work she has to let go her hold. There is something in the very nature of science which must ever prevent her from making any essential change in her position towards life and its action.

Now in this department, which is thus shut out from the reach of science, a great deal more than mere feeling is included. All morality belongs to it. To be sure, science can

and eve wit it i a se it v not Hu the moi mat law a ti SCOL mar con unce evid that min fron unfi life :

188

obs

ma

for a would whice The us to an irreligification E

And

opin

has

ment scien physior to is in i How plete nt, the er, also ubjects at also done: on, but e arbi-

science mind. or the in all found ead in mind; -failing gs subn these d us to whole more ns and ould be y other search r want e mind d while ther in ses that

which human would aditions begins hing in er from life and

rom the g is innce can

observe the facts in human history and in the constitution of man, on which human morality depends. But it views them and the facts which constitute human immorality with equal eye. It has nothing to do with what ought to be, but simply with what is. If it has any moralizing tendency upon man, it is not as science that it possesses this tendency, but as a serious and unselfish occupation of the mind, which keeps it well employed and out of mischief-merits which are not scientific but moral. The truthfulness which Professor Huxley claims for it may or may not be extended beyond the limits of the laboratory. It may or may not have any moral tinge in it whatever. This truthfulness in scientific matters is a professional instinct, like the obligation of the lawyer to give a sound opinion, or of the physician to make a true diagnosis. And as sound lawyers have often been scoundrels, and good physicians have often behaved in a manner which was not for the general health, so it is perfectly conceivable that an able man of science might in matters unconnected with science be most unveracious. The sort of evidence which is required in his science is so different from that which is required in affairs, the whole sphere in which his mind moves during its occupation with science is so different from that of practical life, that his pursuits might actually unfit him for attention to the considerations that operate in life and to the conclusions which should be drawn from them. And accordingly it will be found that Professor Huxley's opinion of the superior general truthfulness of scientific men has by no means passed into general experience. As a security for truthful behaviour in the intercourse of life and for truthful judgments upon its occasions, almost all men would prefer genuine religion, or the practical moral habits which are as unscientific as religion, to scientific eminence. The two claims combine in many cases, but that must not lead us to confound them; and if sometimes religion is considered an insufficient security for truthfulness, that is only because religion sometimes becomes mere science: knowledge without feeling or willing.

But it might seem that at all events there is one department in which scientific evidence must be supreme and scientific methods the best for weighing it, namely, that of physical fact. Where something is said to have happened or to be about to happen in the visible world, there science is in its own domain, and judges of matters peculiarly its own. How then can any kind of proof in this department be complete which does not appeal to science? and how can those

Oct.

who understand scientific proof be expected in matters of this kind to content themselves with any lesser?

Now it is certain that scientific evidence in matters of physical fact is the highest that can be given. If Professor Huxley discovers a fact in the world of sense, he has a right to feel more sure of it than he could be in any other way. We are more sure of physical facts the physical evidence of which is before us than of any facts in the moral world. Yet it is certain that there are vast numbers of physical facts which we all believe, and feel it our duty to believe, of which no physical evidence can be given. Most facts which depend on human will are of this kind. Science cannot tell us what the will is going to do, nor what the will has done, except in the cases, of which there are very few, where actual experiment is possible. There is something in the connexion of will with its effects which is quite beyond the reach of science. Cases meet us constantly in which all facts known would have led us to expect an act of will of one kind, yet in which the act turns out to be of another. And physical effects follow the act. If miracle is to be taken to mean a wonder, the appearance of which in the visible world is not apparently due to the existing visible causes, then the word miracle is applicable to every act of human will, for in none of them are the physical circumstances enough to account for the result, and in none of them can the mysterious agency of their production submit itself to the understanding in its nature or its methods.

But it will be said that, even though this wonder-working power of the will be recognized, it still works within certain limits which science is capable of defining; and while we have no right to make our anticipations the measure of what human wills can do within these bounds, we are incapable of believing that it has done anything beyond them. We answer that the will must work through nature, and cannot use nature against nature's laws. But we are daily learning to be cautious in coming to a conclusion what particular facts this principle permits us, and what it forbids us, to accept. we know is, that when something which we never should have supposed possible for the human will to effect has been done. we shall not say 'here is something done by the will against nature,' but 'here is something which by means of nature the

will was able to do.'

And thus we are constantly believing physical facts as effected by other men to which no scientific test has been applied or could be applied. Not things to which scientific

na WC no eq ho he cep

de

pre

te:

tic

its

the evi wh the us v is r acce and of t

mor

diffe

of s man on it a di does the i life, well form futur their this 1 equal the s condi

in the we ca past. in any of this

tters of ofessor a right er way. ence of d. Yet al facts

ieve, of s which not tell s done, e actual

nnexion reach of known d, yet in physical

mean a d is not he word in none

ount for agency ng in its

working a certain we have at human believing wer that e nature

e nature be cauacts this ept. All buld have een done, il against

facts as has been scientific

ature the

tests are inapplicable, for it is impossible to give that description of any fact; but facts which science cannot get at with its tests, and which depend on a power it cannot gauge, namely the will. Is it untruthful to believe those things? It would be absurd to say so. Life would stop short if we did not believe them. Their evidence cannot be pronounced equal to that of scientific facts; yet nobody is accused of false-hood for attaching to them a credence practically equal to that he gives to any facts of science.

What, then, is the evidence upon which such facts are accepted? It is various in its character, and a great deal of it depends so much on feeling and instinct that it cannot be expressed in words. There is the evidence of human testimony; the evidence of conformity to the character of the agent; the evidence of consistency in the story of the fact, and in the whole history of its antecedents and its consequences. And there is the nameless evidence of sympathy which identifies us with the person, and so shows us what he could do. There is room, as every man in his senses allows, in this unscientific acceptance of facts for every sort of carelessness, credulity, and untruthfulness; but there is room also for just as much of these very qualities in rejection.

The evidence which is applicable in such matters is called moral evidence, a term which, if we mistake not, is used in different senses. For sometimes it means merely an amount of scientific evidence which, though less than might be demanded, is yet sufficient to lay on us a moral obligation to act But the proper meaning of moral evidence seems to be a different thing from this, namely, a kind of evidence which does not belong directly to the physical world at all, but to the moral. This evidence comes to us in the active play of life, in the use of our feelings, conscience, and affections, as well as our reason. It is the kind of evidence upon which we form our judgments of character, our expectations of the future action of others, and in many cases our belief as to their action in the past. It is absolutely impossible to class this kind of evidence in the same category as the scientific, and equally impossible to replace it by that of science. And it is the species of evidence on which the larger part of life is conducted.

And the relations of science to that living action of men in the present which is daily making history show us how far we can allow its claim to be a judge of man's history in the past. Science cannot absolutely withdraw its claim to a voice in any part of human history. For, after all, what is man's

history but the natural history of man, the physical facts in which his nature is displayed; and why should it be withdrawn from the observation of science, any more than the natural history of ants or bees? It is conceivable that the history of mankind should be written as a natural history; 1 that is to say, that every movement, action, and event should be traced to their natural causes and placed under physical laws. But this has never been done, and it is not probable that with our present powers it ever could be done. Here and there science can interpose with a decisive judgment as to what can have been effected, or can in the future be effected, by man. Where it can do this its judgment is final. But it can do so very seldom, and if it could interfere oftener, those who read history with human sympathy, and still more those who are making history by living, would feel that in the scientific view the most important part of history was left out. Between the facts which led up to each act of will and the effects which follow upon it-both of which are physical events and fair subject of science—intervenes the act of will itself, which science cannot reach. And this gives us two points of view from which to regard human history and life: one as a series of acts of free will, and the other as the operation of laws without any will at all. Each of them, while you regard it alone, is apparently quite complete and sufficient. And no way has yet been discovered of marking off a boundary between them; sensible people can only allow to each its proper value and place without permitting it the liberty of devouring its antagonist. It is possible that if we knew the inner life of even ants and bees, they might protest that their natural history was not the whole of their history, and that if they themselves tried to act as if it was the whole, the very spring and source of life would be taken out of their existence. But we men are able to speak for ourselves, and protest that we cannot be rightly treated as the creatures of matter and motion, and that you will not be able to judge of the facts of our existence in the past, nor to predict them in the future, if you omit to take account of the action of will. And this protest cannot be accepted without limiting the claims of science, which knows nothing of the action of will.

Now religion is a part of human history. The alleged facts of revelation are facts alleged in human history, and the consequent acts of thinking, feeling, and willing demanded from man by religion are the materials out of which other facts in history are made. And while science must be allowed

ge th pu

me

18

a

ore im It an we nat

ma Ho con me

imp

ma

may doe has and not tian the a kit they betwand

whice reall mine as tr ness and

and

the a

¹ See Darwin's Life, vol. iii. p. 99.

facts in

hdrawn

natural

story of

at is to

traced

s. But

vith our

science

ve been

Vhere it

seldom,

ory with

history

nost im-

ts which

w upon

bject of

cannot

which to

s of free

any will

parently

peen dis-

sensible

nd place

tagonist.

ants and

s not the

ed to act

ife would

to speak

reated as

ill not be

st, nor to

nt of the

d without

ng of the

e alleged

, and the

demanded

ich other

e allowed

1888

a voice in respect of them, she cannot be allowed a supremacy as to the facts of religion, which does not belong to her in the general history of man's life.

II. We come now to consider Professor Huxley's claim that many scientific men estimate as highly as any one 'the purely spiritual elements of the Christian faith.' Professor Huxley is justly celebrated for making things clear; but the meaning which he here attaches to the expression 'spiritual elements' is not clear. If we were to take the words in their ordinary meaning, we should consider the word 'spiritual' as implying faith and devotion towards a being above nature. It is quite true that great numbers of scientific men do feel and practise this faith and devotion. And we should all gladly welcome the permission to include Professor Huxley's great name among their number. But it is to be feared that he intends his words to be taken in another meaning: that, namely, of a morality very lofty in its claims, deeply tinged with emotion, and depending on a highly sublimated view of matter, but still all natural, all physical, and all material. However, in order to be sure of not going wrong, we shall consider the words 'spiritual elements' first in the one of these meanings, and then in the other.

Taking the words as excluding the supernatural, it seems impossible to say that a man whose faith is of this kind estimates highly the spiritual elements of the Christian faith. He may claim to have a faith and a spiritual faith: that point does not come under our discussion. But the Christian faith has essentially depended on a supernatural belief, and fed itself and spread itself by the power of this. A faith which does not include the supernatural, whatever other elements of Christianity it may reproduce, has no right to say that it includes the Christian spiritual element. Materialism sometimes claims a kind of spirituality of its own. Materialists suppose that they are abolishing, or at all events softening, the contrast between the new and the old by using the language of idealism and protesting that we are not to attach to matter that low and coarse conception which a former generation held, and which was derived from a contrast with mind which does not really exist. Matter, they tell us, is only known to us through mind, and is a mental, and if you please a spiritual, thing just as truly as a material. But if the practical issue of the business is that our power of will vanishes into matter and motion, and that we ourselves are nothing but forms of matter, with the aggregations of which we began to exist and with the dis-

VOL. XXVII.-NO. LIII.

whether this matter, in which we are drowned both here and hereafter, be gross or spiritual. When Professor Huxley attributes an inferior veracity to non-scientific people, he means, of course, by the expression only an unconscious failure to look facts in the face. He will not, therefore, resent our saying in the same sense, that he cannot have a deeper feeling of the unconscious unveracity of theologians in any fiction they try to pass off on themselves, than they have of the unconscious unveracity of men of science in attempting to dress up matter to look like spirit.

If, therefore, we are to take the spiritual elements which Professor Huxley values to mean elements which may exist without belief in the supernatural, we pronounce with the utmost confidence that they are not the spiritual elements of the Christian faith. Professor Huxley does well to appeal to the 'imagination of these people' to recognize the existence of spiritual Christians who believe in nothing but what is physical; for the imagination is the only faculty of man which

is capable of accepting such a paradox.

But let us suppose that Professor Huxley means by spiritual elements not those which are purely physical, but such as make some recognition of a supernatural world: not so definite as those who believe in miracles believe in, but still real. It is certain that there are a very large number of such persons, and that their faith enables them to appreciate the spiritual elements of Christianity in a quite different fashion from those who are absolute materialists, and who can but value the outward conduct to which Christianity leads, while regarding its inward principles as pure error. They call themselves agnostics, but that word does not in ordinary use express an absolute denial that we can know anything of God. It rather denotes a knowledge, vague but real, which enables us to know that there is something beyond nature, but forbids us to characterize it. The knowledge that there is even something there is real knowledge; and it is probably impossible for one who holds so much as this to help going further and making some application of it in history. He believes that, if not as a certainty yet as a possibility, and if not in particular events yet in the general course of nature, he can recognize the work of the great Something which he will not claim to know. Mr. Herbert Spencer talks of 'the naturally-revealed end towards which the Power manifested throughout Evolution works,' an expression which implies a revelation of the divine will to man as real as that taught by St. Paul.

The principles of one who entertains such a faith as this

di ag it, spi Ch is an Ch ma

18

no ima to i and will

nat

to t

wou

boo

dw

app part ance no a imp pure evid mira truth what able and mate wher room eithe ence this a

which evide possil pugna ourse perier or pre 1888

re and y attrieans, of to look ying in of the hev try nscious matter

s which ay exist vith the nents of ppeal to xistence what is an which

eans by sical, but orld: not e in, but umber of ppreciate nt fashion can but ads, while call themse express God. It enables us forbids us ven someimpossible urther and lieves that, ot in partican recog-1 not claim ly-revealed out Evolution of the ul.

aith as this

differ from the Church not so much in kind as in degree. agnosticism admits of revelation; nay, positively believes in it, and makes it a practical and important element in a genuine spiritual life. And if he advances on the one side to meet Christianity, it on the other side advances to meet him. There is a large infusion of agnosticism in Christianity. It is over and over again declared in the Bible, and recognized by the Church, that we cannot know God with completeness. 'No man hath seen God at any time,' is certainly not spoken of bodily sight alone; nor is St. Paul's description of Him as dwelling in the light which no man can approach unto, Whom no man hath seen or can see. The very boldness of the human images under which God is presented in the Bible seem often to imply a feeling that the subject in itself is beyond reach, and, because it is beyond reach, resorts to whatever images

will make this inaccessible truth practical for man.

But can men who have a vague but real faith in the supernatural adopt the language of Professor Huxley and say that to them a belief in the miraculous, on the evidence offered, would be simply immoral? The expression 'the miraculous' appears to show that the writer is not simply thinking of the particular miracles of the New Testament, but of the appearance of a miraculous element in the world at all. He holds no abstract principles rendering his belief in the miraculous impossible; he is diligent to impress on us that it is to him pure matter of evidence. But looking at it as pure matter of evidence, can the believer in the unknowable really set the miraculous at an utter distance, and reject it in the name of truth and morality? If the unknowable has no connexion whatever with the world known to us, how do we come to be able to know that there is such a thing? If the human brain and the human mind have worked through all time upon material impulses, and under a material system of causation, where or how has this element of so different a character found room to make itself felt by them? And if the unknowable, either by acting through matter and force, or by some influence outside matter and force, has become known to man, this amounts to an interposition of the supernatural in nature which prepares the mind for miracles; in other words, it is evidence that the miraculous is possible. It will not be found possible to recoil from the miraculous with the absolute repugnance which Professor Huxley shows, without shutting ourselves so completely within the circle of our sensible experience that we ought to cease to talk about the unknowable, or pretend even to know that there is such a thing.

Perhaps it may be replied that the knowledge that there is an unknowable, with the reasons of this knowledge, belong to the sphere of the mind, while the miraculous belongs to the outward world. But the distinction will not stand. It will not stand when it is used for the defence of religion, as, for instance, to find a sphere for answers to prayer, without supposing God to interfere in the processes of external nature. For the connexions of mental changes with material movement in the structure of our frame, have been established so far that it is untruthful to presume that they are not complete. is probably no thought of the mind of any sort whatever which has not its accompaniment and counterpart in motions of the matter of our frame, motions connected with physical causes preceding just as much as any other part of the world of nature. Whatever argument stands good as a defence of prayer for mental influences, stands good as a defence of prayer for rain, for it involves equally the expectation of an influence brought to bear upon matter. The brain or the clouds, what is the difference? Unless indeed we pray to a God who we know cannot answer, for the sake of exerting a subjective influence on ourselves: a make-believe and an unreality which honest men should be ashamed to resort to. But if the solidarity of the physical circle is true for one purpose, it is true all round. There are no gaps in the circle, but whatever notion reaches us from beyond, were it but the idea of the existence of the unknowable, serves to show that, in some wonderful way inscrutable to our understanding, the supernatural can make its way into nature without infringing law.

And this, then, is our comment upon the second text from Professor Huxley. We do not doubt in the least that there are many scientific men who, without accepting belief in miracles, value the spiritual elements of the Christian faith. But if they mean by spiritual elements that morality tinged with emotion which may exist without belief in the supernatural, especially in a community in which the influences of supernatural belief are spread even among those who do not personally share it, they are mistaken in supposing that this materialistic spirituality is really the Christian spirit. While, on the other hand, if they mean by spiritual elements such forms of moral thought and action as come from a sense or feeling of the supernatural, this cannot exist except on the supposition of some kind of revelation of the supernatural within the life of man, drawing with it in principle the same interposition of the infinite in the finite, which goes by the

name of the miraculous.

th w sp ki ar to

S

e

W

The period de this ever

is s

thi

be

por of and use fear our is a and who eter thou

which for in with extra chara huma and of and

the g hope: this v life, in at there , belong gs to the It will n, as, for out supl nature. ovement o far that . There whatever motions physical the world lefence of efence of ion of an in or the pray to a exerting a nd an unresort to. r one purcircle, but it the idea at, in some the supernging law. econd text e least that ting belief istian faith. lity tinged the superfluences of vho do not ng that this rit. While, ments such a sense or cept on the upernatural

Oct.

When Christians speak of the spiritual, they mean something which is dependent on supernatural influences; and when they speak of the supernatural, they do not mean a something entirely out of relation to themselves, a non-existent existence, an unpractical dream, if that is even a dream which takes no forms; but they mean something which they know to exist, and which, therefore, bears a real relation to their minds. Whatever be the reasons by which those for whom Professor Huxley speaks are moved to believe in a spiritual element, whether it be the universal consent of mankind or the imperative demands of their own moral nature, are reasons with Christians for believing in God. Are they to be accused of untruthfulness in this? 'To them' it would be absolutely immoral to stop short of believing in God. They do not dare to palm off upon themselves that which appears to their thought nothing better than an unreality and a

deception.

III. God's connexion with the mind and life of man being thus assured as a basis, Christ builds upon it. No one has ever claimed for the religion of Christ that the evidence of it is scientific. But it would be a great mistake to suppose that this admission throws Christianity upon sentiment for its support. It is the most comprehensive example of that species of belief on which our active life depends, and which grows and strengthens by its adaptation to our faculties in their use. It takes up and completes the affections, the hopes and fears, and all the complicated system of motives upon which our moral life depends. It brings nearer to us Him who is already not far from everyone, for in Him we live and move and have our being, and it makes better known to us Him whom we already know. It uplifts to communion with the eternal the soul of man, which is already full of vague thoughts and longings for the eternal. And the facts by which this great system calls out our faith and love are fitted for its purpose as a body of living and active truth. witnessed to by the words and lives of a number of men of extraordinary powers, moral and intellectual, of very various characters of mind. It connects itself with a long series of human history. It takes up and satisfies the religious wants and observances which have shown themselves most strongly and permanently in various early religions, but especially in the greatest and deepest of them, the Jewish. It quickens the hopes and fears of man by extending his prospects beyond this world. Above all it embodies itself in a perfect human life, in which ever since it was seen on earth the best men have

e the same

goes by the

found that which raises them higher, and the bad not only reproof for their selfishness, but also the hope and opportunity of amendment.

Now the miraculous forms an essential element in the life of our Lord. It is not a separable accident, but part of the texture. There is no room for doubt that He claimed to work miracles; many of the sayings and acts in which His moral treatment of men and the spiritual character which has attracted faith to Him come out best, accompanied His miraculous cures. Even were this not so, the facts of His own history, which place Him in the relation to men upon which His power over them depends, are miraculous: a Christ who never rose would not be the Christ of Christianity. And even if neither of these things were the case, the spiritual elements of the life of Christ, in the most complete separation from outward events that could be made, would still be miraculous. All thinking, feeling, and willing have the nature of miracle. They rise up amidst the series of material causation without our knowing how they arise; and they produce great effects in the world of facts without our understanding how they produce them. But we see this miraculous character in the thinking, feeling, and willing of our Lord more plainly than in any other case; and should see it even if those events which we ordinarily call His miracles could be removed from His history.

Thus His miracles appear to us to be in Him just what the great deeds of great men are in them. These men would be great even if they did no such deeds; but such deeds are the natural effect and testimony of their greatness. The belief in the great deed depends in some degree upon our knowledge that there was a great man to do it; but our knowledge of the greatness of the man is also built up from the greatness of his deeds, some of them producing vast effects in the world, and some of them only consisting of a word or a gesture, but all of them contributing to the impression of the whole.

It may be said of any such deed that our certainty of it is inferior to that which we have of a fact tested by science. The evidence is of a different kind. The one is physical evidence, as far apart from man's moral nature as the forces which act upon his body. The other appeals to him as a living spirit, and all his living powers come into play in the act of believing it. And it is universally felt that to call for scientific tests in these matters of life and action is not reasonable so long as you have as much of the other kind of testimony as ought to suffice. Our moral qualities

and bel

phy the the pas exa and an a the

stoc

to e

beca

and is no evid work out mind Gos as the contract of the capar

to h

Chritined intel form lous. the (faith the rinvol scien

a form which our no cannot years living

1888

t only

he life of the ned to ch His which ed His of His upon us: a tianity. e spirimplete would g have ries of e; and out our

all His
ust what
n would
eeds are
The ber knowowledge
reatness
ne world,
ture, but
lle.

ee this

lling of

should

le.
nty of it
science.
physical
as the
is to him
into play
t that to
action is
he other
qualities

and our affections are educated by constant acceptance of belief in deeds past or present, all of them outrunning the physical causes of which we are aware. And we feel that the call for physical evidence would change the attitude of the mind from a condition in which the deed which we believe passes at once into use for the purposes of feeling and example, to one in which it becomes the subject of speculation, and is very likely never to be anything else. We consider it an absolutely untruthful proceeding to separate the fact from the person who performs it, and consider its evidence as if it stood perfectly alone; only less untruthful than it would be to determine that we will believe the fact without evidence because it seems to us what might be expected of the person.

As we view the matter, the whole history of man's moral and spiritual life prepares us for Christianity, and Christianity is miraculous. Professor Huxley compendiously states the evidence for the miracles as he views it, by resting it upon the word of the unknown authors of the Gospels. But he leaves out the whole spiritual preparation for Christianity in the mind and the history of man, and omits the acceptance of the Gospels by the Christian Church of their time and ever since, as the basis upon which this great working system recognizes itself to be founded, and upon which its life proceeds. It is no more the part of truthfulness to disregard this portion of the evidence, than it would be to consider the doings of men apart from their character and from the effects we know them to have worked.

Professor Huxley warns those who persist in identifying Christianity with the miraculous, that their systems are destined to fall to the ground. The prophecy would be more intelligible if he or any one else had ever presented to us a form of Christianity which is not identified with the miraculous. What is the use of getting rid of a few miracles from the Gospels, even if that could be done without fatal injury to faith, if after they were gone the most etherialized version of the religion could not be given without somewhere or other involving an influence of spirit on matter which is beyond science?

Miraculous Christianity will never be expelled except by a form of religion which will do the positive work for souls which it now effects. Its work appeals to spiritual wants of our nature which are the deepest things in us, and which we cannot disregard without gross untruthfulness. And as the years of absolute free speech about religion, in which we are living, pass over, and no one produces to us the better religion

which is to supersede Christianity, the conviction grows stronger and stronger in our mind that it cannot be produced. Positivism, with a courage and sincerity for which we cannot be too grateful, attempted a new religion at which the mass of mankind only smile. The religion of the Unknowable has never proceeded even so far as to establish a tabernacle. The religion of the Unconscious is equally far behind. The Eternal, not ourselves, is the creed only of an individual or two. And while these unsuccessful ventures have at least issued some species of prospectus, even that cannot be said for the spiritual elements of the Christian faith which Professor Huxley claims to hold while excluding the miraculous. No blindfold adherent of any priesthood ever accepted a creed so undefined as this. And Professor Huxley would be the last man to say that truthfulness can consist in accepting a form of words the import of which we cannot understand.

4

ov mi or wh pro sai ow beg lor an cou

mig tion

VI 184

grows oduced. cannot

mass of ble has

e. The

Eternal,

d some

piritual

v claims

old ad-

defined

man to

f words

And

ART. VII.—BOSWELL AND HIS EDITORS.

1. The Life of Samuel Johnson, LL.D., together with the Journal of a Tour to the Hebrides. By JAMES BOSWELL, Esq. New Editions, with Notes and Appendices by ALEX-ANDER NAPIER, M.A. Six volumes. (London, 1884.)

The Life of Samuel Johnson, &c. By JAMES BOSWELL.
 Illustrated with Portraits by Sir Joshua Reynolds.
 Edited by HENRY MORLEY, LL.D. Five volumes.

(London, 1886.)

3. The Life of Samuel Johnson, &c. A Reprint of the First Edition. To which are added Mr. Boswell's Corrections and Additions, issued in 1792, the variations of the Second Edition, with some of the Author's Notes prepared for the Third; the whole Edited, with new Notes, by PERCY FITZGERALD, M.A., F.S.A. In three volumes. Second Edition, with a Preface by the Editor, and a Boswell Bibliography by H. R. TEDDER, F.S.A. (London, 1888.)

4. Life of Samuel Johnson. By Lieutenant-Colonel F. GRANT.

'Great Writers' Series. (London, 1887.)

5. Boswell's Life of Johnson, including Boswell's Journal of a Tour to the Hebrides, and Johnson's Diary of a Journey into North Wales. Edited by GEORGE BIRKBECK HILL, D.C.L., Pembroke College, Oxford. In six volumes. (Oxford, 1887.)

Writing to Pope in 1728 concerning the annotation of the Dunciad, Swift comments upon the prompt oblivion which overtakes the minor details of contemporary history. 'Twenty miles from London nobody understands hints, initial letters, or town facts or passages, and in a few years not even those who live in London.' A somewhat similar opinion was expressed by Johnson. 'In sixty or seventy years, or less,' he said, 'all works which describe manners require notes.' His own biography is a striking case in point. Almost from the beginning the editorial pen was freely exercised upon it, and long before the minor term he mentions it was already, to use an expressive phrase of Beaumarchais, 'rongée d'extraits et couverte de critiques.' With Mr. Crober's edition of 1831 it might have been thought that the endurable limits of illustration and interpretation had been reached, and, indeed, for some time that opinion seems to have obtained. But in the

t

th

tŀ

be

th

to

17

for

ha

de

Ty

alı

tai

SOI

tio

ter

ful

ma

clo

cal

say

gaz

Na

Toh

pri

The

sup

inse

figu

mer

pub

of :

of ti

In t

Tho

last few years three other editions of importance have made their appearance, each of which has its specific merits, while thirteen years ago was published another, recently reissued, which had, at least, the merit of an excellent plan. Boswell's book itself may now, in Parliamentary language, be taken for 'read.' As Johnson said of Goldsmith's *Traveller*, 'its merit is established, and individual praise or censure can neither augment nor diminish it.' But the publication, in Lieutenant-Colonel Grant's excellent brief memoir, of the first systematic bibliography of Johnson's works, coupled with the almost simultaneous issue by Mr. H. R. Tedder, the able and accomplished librarian to the Athenæum Club, of a bibliography of Boswell's masterpiece, affords a sufficient pretext for some review of Boswell and his editors.

Johnson died on the evening of Monday, December 13, According to a letter dated May 5, 1785, from Michael Lort to Bishop Percy, printed in Nichols's Literary Illustrations, and somewhat too readily accepted by Mr. Napier, the first Life appeared on the day following the death. But this is a manifest mistake, as reference to contemporary newspapers. or even to the pamphlet itself, should have sufficed to show. At p. 120 is an account of Johnson's funeral, which did not take place until Monday, December 20. Moreover, the portrait by T. Trotter, for which Johnson is said to have sat 'some time since,' is dated the 16th, and in an article in the Gentleman's Magazine for December it is expressly stated that the book 'was announced before the Doctor had been two days dead,' and appeared on the ninth morning after his death. It may even be doubtful if this is strictly accurate, as the first notification of the pamphlet in the Public Advertiser appears on Thursday, the 23rd, and promises its publication that week. Its title is The Life of Samuel Johnson, LL.D., with Occasional Remarks on his Writings, an Authentic Copy of his Will, and a Catalogue of his Works, &c. 1785. It is an octavo of iv, 144 pages, and its publisher was the G. Kearsley, of 46 Fleet Street, who issued so many of Goldsmith's works. Its author, too, was the William Cooke who subsequently wrote recollections of Goldsmith in the European Magazine for 1793. In Kearsley's advertisement great pains are taken to avert the possible charge of catchpenny haste, by the statement that the book had been drawn up for some time, but had been withheld from motives of delicacy. This anticipatory defence is, however, negatived by a communication in the Gentleman's Magazine for December, evidently written by or on behalf of the author, in which certain of its errors are excused upon the ground of

KUM

made while sued, well's en for merit either mantmatic lmost

ccom-

Oct.

hy of some er 13, ichael ustraer, the this is apers, show. id not ortrait 'some Gentlenat the o days death. as the ertiser ication LL.D.,ic Copy earsley, y wrote r 1793. vert the

hat the

ithheld

owever,

zine for

thor, in

ound of

'hurry.' It professes, nevertheless, to be 'a sketch, warm from the life,' and, although speedily superseded by more leisurely efforts, is certainly not without interest as the earliest of its kind, even if it is not quite so early as it has hitherto been affirmed to be.

Cooke's Life was followed by articles in the European and the Gentleman's Magazines for December, which, according to the fashion of those days, appeared at the end and not at the beginning of the month. That in the European Magazine, which was more critical than biographical, was continued through several numbers, and contains nothing to distinguish it from the respectable and laborious journey-work of the period. The sketch in the Gentleman's Magazine is of a far more meritorious character, and was from the pen of Tom Tyers, the 'Tom Restless' of the Idler, and the son of Ionathan, 'the founder of that excellent place of publick amusement, Vauxhall Gardens.' Tyers had really known Johnson with a certain degree of intimacy, and even Boswell is obliged to admit that Tyers lived with his illustrious friend 'in as easy a manner as almost any of his very numerous acquaintance.' He has certainly not caught Johnson's style, as his memories are couched in abrupt shorthand sentences which are the reverse of Johnsonese. But apart from a certain vanity of classical quotation, with which he seems to have been twitted by his contemporaries, 'Tom Restless' writes like a gentleman, and is fully entitled to the praise of having produced the first animated sketch of Johnson, who, from a sentence towards the close, appears to have anticipated that Tyers might be one day called upon 'to assist a posthumous account of him.' Mr. Napier says that Tyers continued his sketch in the Gentleman's Magazine for January 1785. This again is an error, which Mrs. Napier practically corrects, since in the valuable volume of Johnsoniana which accompanies her husband's edition, she prints no more than is to be found in the December number. The mistake probably arises from the fact that in the annual supplement to the Gentleman's Magazine for 1784 Tyers inserted a few corrections, which might with propriety have figured as foot-notes in Mrs. Napier's reprint.

Without a close examination of contemporary advertisement sheets it would be difficult to fix precisely the date of publication of the next biography. It is a small duodecimo of 197 pages, entitled *Memoirs of the Life and Writings of the Late Dr. Samuel Johnson*. The title-page is dated 1785. In the Preface mention is made of assistance rendered by Thomas Davies, the actor-bookseller of Russell Street,

Covent Garden, who is described as 'the late.' The book must therefore have appeared after Thursday, May 5, when Davies died. Its author is supposed to have been the Rev. William Shaw, 'a modest and a decent man,' referred to in Boswell as the compiler of 'an Erse grammar,' subsequently issued in 1788 as An Analysis of the Gaelic Language. Colour is given to this supposition by the fact that another of the persons who supplied information was Mr. Elphinston, by whom Shaw was introduced to Johnson, and by the references made to the Ossianic controversy, in which Shaw did battle on Johnson's side against Macpherson. For the book itself, it is like most of the pre-Boswellian efforts, Tyers's sketch excepted, mainly critical, and makes

no attempt to reproduce Johnson's talk or sayings.

Chit-chat and personal characteristics are, however, somewhat more fully represented in what-neglecting for the moment Boswell's Journal of a Tour to the Hebrides-may be regarded as the next effort in the biographical sequence, the famous Anecdotes of the Late Samuel Johnson, LL.D., during the Last Twenty Years of his Life, by Hesther Lynch Piozzi, which was published in March 1786. Written in Italy, where she was then living, it was printed in London. Its success, as might perhaps have been anticipated from her long connection with Johnson, was exceptional. The first edition, like that of Fielding's Amelia, was exhausted on the day of publication, and other editions followed rapidly. Boswell, as may be guessed, was not well disposed towards the work of his fortunate rival, and in his own book is at considerable pains to expose her 'mistaken notion of Dr. Johnson's character,' while his coadjutor, Malone, who tells us that she made 500l. by the Anecdotes, plainly calls her both 'inaccurate and artful.' We, who are neither editors nor biographers of Boswell, need not assume so censorious an attitude. That Mrs. Piozzi, by habit of mind, and from the circumstances under which her narrative was compiled, was negligent in her facts (she even blunders as to the date when she first met Johnson) may be admitted, and it is not inconceivable that, as Mrs. Napier says in the 'Prefatory Notice' to her Johnsoniana, her account would have been 'more tender and true if it had been given by Mrs. Thrale instead of Mrs. Piozzi.' But the cumulative effect of her vivacious and disconnected recollections (even Malone admits them to be 'lively') is rather corroborative of, than at variance with, that produced by Johnson's more serious biographers. Her opportunities were great—perhaps greater than those of any

ir

b W

P to C

To Va

0 cl

h O SI he

re

ol to ez M

fo

book

when

Rev.

to in

ently

nage. other

phin-

d by

vhich

erson.

ellian

nakes

some-

r the

-may

ience,

L.D.,

_ynch

en in

ndon.

m her

first

ed on

pidly. wards

is at

f Dr.

tells

ls her

rs nor

us an

m the

d, was

when

incon-

otice'

tender

f Mrs.

to be

with,

of her contemporaries—her intercourse with Johnson was most unrestrained and unconventional, and, notwithstanding all its faults, her little volume (which we are glad to see has been recently reprinted in popular form by Professor Henry Morley) remains an essential part of Johnsonian literature.

Boswell, whose magnum obus we are now approaching, so

Boswell, whose magnum opus we are now approaching, so fills the foreground with his fame that the partial obliteration of his predecessors is almost a necessary consequence. In this way Sir John Hawkins, whose Life of Samuel Johnson, LL.D., 1787, comes next in importance to Mrs. Piozzi's Anecdotes, has suffered considerably; and his book, which immediately after Johnson's death was advertised as 'forthcoming,' is, to use the words of a recent writer, 'spoken of with contempt by many who have never taken the trouble to do more than turn over its leaves.' That he seems to have been extremely unpopular can scarcely be denied. Malone, who accumulates a page of his characteristics, says that Percy called him 'most detestable,' Reynolds 'absolutely dishonest,' and Dyer 'mischievous, uncharitable, and malignant,' to which garland of dispraise the recorder adds, as his own contribution, that he was 'rigid and sanctimonious.' Johnson, too, styled him 'an unclubable man.' But against all this censure it must be remembered that he was selected as one of the first members of 'The Club' (to whose promoters his character can scarcely have been unknown, for he had belonged to the earlier association in Ivy Lane), and that Johnson appointed him one of his executors. Boswell, whose vanity Hawkins had wounded by the slight and supercilious way in which he spoke of him in the Life, could scarcely be supposed to feel kindly to him; and though he professes to have modified what he said of this particular rival on account of his death, we have no means of knowing how much he suppressed. He gives, nevertheless, what on the whole is a not unfair idea of Hawkins's volume. 'However inadequate and improper,' he says, 'as a Life of Dr. Johnson, and however discredited by unpardonable inaccuracies in other respects, [it] contains a collection of curious anecdotes and observations which few men but its authour could have brought together.' What is commendatory in this verdict is not exaggerated, and those who care enough for Johnson to travel beyond Boswell will certainly find Hawkins by no means so ponderous as Boswell would have us believe. Many of the particulars he gives are certainly not to be found elsewhere, and his knowledge of the seamy side of letters in Georgian London was 'extensive and peculiar.'

Her of any

To speak of Hawkins after Mrs. Piozzi is a sequence more convenient than chronological, as it involves the neglect of an intermediate biographer. But the Essay on the Life, Character, and Writings of Dr. Samuel Johnson, from the pen of the Rev. Joseph Towers, which comes between them in 1786, has no serious import. It treats more of the writings than the character and life, and, except as the respectable effort of an educated man, need not detain us from Boswell himself, whose first offering at the shrine of his adoration was made in September 1785, when he published the Journal of a Tour to the Hebrides with Samuel Johnson, LL.D. The tour, of which Johnson had himself given an account in his Journey to the Western Islands of Scotland, had taken place as far back as 1773, and Boswell's journal had lain by him ever since. But the manuscript had been lent to different persons-to Mrs. Thrale among the rest. 'I am glad you read Boswell's journal,' said Johnson to her; 'you are now sufficiently informed of the whole transaction, and need not regret that you did not make the tour to the Hebrides.' A more emphatic testimony is contained in the *Journal* itself. Johnson, we are told, read it diligently from day to day, and declared that he took great delight in doing so, 'It might be printed,' he said, 'were the subject fit for printing,' and further on he forbade Boswell to contract it. In his dedication to Malone, whose acquaintance he made in Baldwin's printing office while correcting the proofs, Boswell showed that he was conscious of the strong point of his work, 'the numerous conversations, which (he said) form the most valuable part.' In the third edition, dated August 1786, the success of the book justified an ampler note of gratification:

'I will venture to predict, that this specimen of the colloquial talents and extemporaneous effusions of my illustrious fellow-traveller will become still more valuable, when, by the lapse of time, he shall have become an ANCIENT; when all those who can now bear testimony to the transcendent powers of his mind shall have passed away; and no other memorial of this great and good man shall remain but he following Journal, the other anecdotes and letters preserved by his friends, and those incomparable works, which have for many years been in the highest estimation, and will be read and admired as long as the English language shall be spoken or understood.'

Whether this variation of *exegi monumentum* is justifiable or not—and certainly some of the 'incomparable works' have but faintly fulfilled their promise of perpetuity—Boswell's accentuation of his distinctive excellence, his admirably cha-

an what ha m D

of

of

I

ne Lithe In ear wh

nes

the min the diff men tior scri hum

app Bos a le enti

and published thro com apper time racteristic records of conversations, is unanswerable evidence of a settled purpose and a definite aim.

On a fly-leaf of the *Tour to the Hebrides* (not, as Mr. Napier seems to suppose, confined to the third edition) was announced as 'preparing for the press' the greater work by which the *Tour* was succeeded in 1791. At first it was to have been comprised in one quarto volume, but it ultimately made its appearance in two. The publisher was Charles Dilly, of the Poultry, and the title-page ran as follows:—

'The Life of Samuel Johnson, LL.D., comprehending an Account of his Studies and numerous Works, in chronological Order; a Series of his Epistolary Correspondence and Conversations with many eminent Persons; and various original Pieces of his Composition never before published: the whole exhibiting a View of Literature and Literary Men in Great-Britain, for near half a Century, during which he flourished.'

In the dedication to Sir Joshua Reynolds, referring to the earlier book, Boswell dwells upon a difference of treatment which distinguishes the Life from its predecessor. In the Tour he had, it seems, been too open in his communications. freely exhibiting to the world the dexterity of Johnson's wit, even when that wit was exercised upon himself. His frankness had in some quarters been mistaken for insensibility, and he has therefore in the Life been 'more reserved,' and though he tells nothing but the truth, has still kept in his mind that the whole truth is not always to be exposed. In the Advertisement which succeeds he enlarges upon the difficulties of his task, and the labour involved in the arrangement and collection of material, and he expresses his obligations to Malone, who had heard nearly all the book in manuscript, and had revised about half of it in type. Seventeen hundred copies of it were printed, and although the price in boards was two guineas, between May (when the book appeared) and August twelve hundred of these had been sold. Boswell, who gives this information to his friend Temple, in a letter dated the 22nd of the latter month, expects that the entire impression would be sold off before Christmas.

This hope, however, does not appear to have been realized, since the second edition, in three volumes, considerably revised, and including 'eight sheets of additional matter,' was not published until July 1793. During the progress of the book through the press many additional letters and anecdotes had come to hand, which were inserted in an introduction and appendix. These numerous improvements were at the same time printed in quarto form for the benefit of the purchasers

from of his ished inson, an tland, ournal been rest. on to transee tour

Oct.

ience

glect

Life,

1 the

them

writ-

o connce he proofs, point said) dated r note

tained

gently

ght in

loquial raveller re shall r testil away; ain but reved by many dmired

able or ' have swell's y chaof the issue of 1791, and sold at half-a-crown, under the title of *The Principal Corrections and Additions to the First Edition of Mr. Boswell's Life of Dr. Johnson.* As in the *Tour to the Hebrides*, the success of his labours inspired their author with a greater exultation of prefatory language. Referring to the death of Reynolds, which had taken place in the interval between the first and second editions, he says that Sir Joshua had read the book, and given 'the strongest testimony to its fidelity.' He has *Johnsonised* the land, he says farther on, and he trusts 'they will not only talk but think Johnson.'

He was still busily amending and retouching for a third edition when he died on May 19, 1795, at his house, No. 47 Great Portland Street (not Great Poland Street, as stated The task was taken up by Malone, who had . by Mr. Napier). been his adviser from the first, and under Malone's superintendence was issued, 'revised and augmented,' the third edition of 1799. From the fact that it contains Boswell's latest touches, this edition is held to be the most desirable by John-Boswell's friends contributed several notes, son students. some of which were the work of the author's second son, James, then a student at Brasenose College, Oxford. Fourth, fifth, and sixth editions followed, all under the editorship of Malone. Then, shortly after the publication in 1811 of the last of these, Malone himself died. Seventh, eighth, and ninth editions, all avowedly or unavowedly reproducing Malone's last issue, subsequently appeared, the ninth having some additions by Alexander Chalmers. Then came what is known as the 'Oxford' edition, by F. P. Walesby, of Wadham College, which contained some fresh recollections of Johnson and some stray particulars as to Boswell, whose portrait for the first time is added. A tiny issue in one volume, beautifully printed in double columns at the Chiswick Press, is the only one that needs mention previous to the historical edition by the Right Honourable John Wilson Croker, published in 1831.

As will be seen, the foregoing paragraphs deal more with Johnson's earlier biographers than with the ostensible subject of this review, Boswell's editors. But the earlier biographers are, if not the chief, at least no inconsiderable part of the material employed by those editors, and by none more conspicuously, more ably, and at the same time more unhappily, than by the one whose labours attracted the censure of Macaulay and Carlyle. What is most distinctive in Boswell is Boswell's method and Boswell's manner. Long before, Johnson had touched upon this personal quality when writing of the

out ima imp frie cau bee he

18

value and impospice in his reaction, inter species stran

whic.

consi

perar

misce his fin his an his re point much to Ma after alterat reason author at leas Boswe But th pared

cess alr experie VOL.

as Mai

content

omittin

e title

dition

to the

with

to the

terval

oshua

ny to

er on,

third

No. 47 stated

o had .

iperin-

third

latest

John-

notes,

nd son, Fourth,

editorn 1811

eighth,

oducing

having e what

f Wad-

ions of ose por-

volume,

Press, is

istorical er, pub-

ore with

subject graphers

t of the

ore conhappily,

of Mac-

oswell is Johnson

ig of the

n.'

Corsican tour. 'Your history' (he said) 'is like other histories, but your journal is in a very high degree curious and delightful . . . Your history was copied from books; your journal rose out of your own experience and observation. You express images which operated strongly upon yourself, and you have impressed them with great force upon your readers.' From less friendly critics the verdict was the same. Walpole, though caustic and flippant, speaks to like purport; and Gray, who has been 'pleased and moved strangely,' declares it proves what he has always maintained, 'that any fool may write a most valuable book by chance, if he will only tell us what he heard and saw with veracity.' This faculty of communicating his impressions accurately to his reader is Boswell's most conspicuous gift. Present in his first book, it was more present in his second, and when he began his great biography it had reached its highest point. So individual is his manner, so unique his method of collecting and arranging his information, that to disturb the native character of his narrative by interpolating foreign material, must of necessity impair its specific character and imperil its personal note. Yet, by some strange freak of fate, this was just the very treatment to which it was subjected.

From the very outset indeed, it would seem, his text was considerably 'edited.' Boswell, like many writers of his temperament, was fond of stimulating his flagging invention by miscellaneous advice, and it is plain from the comparison of his finished work with his rough notes, that in order to make his anecdotes more direct and effective he freely manipulated his reminiscences. But it is quite probable—and this is a point that we do not remember to have seen touched on—that much of the trimming which his records received is attributable to Malone. At all events, when Malone took up the editing after Boswell's death, he is known to have made many minor alterations in the process of 'settling the text,' and it is only reasonable to suppose that he had done the same thing in the author's lifetime, a supposition which would account for some at least of the variations which have been observed between Boswell's anecdotes in their earliest and their latest forms. But the admitted alterations of Malone were but trifles compared with the extraordinary readjustment which the book, as Malone left it, received at the hands of Mr. Croker. Not content with working freely upon the text itself—compressing, omitting, transposing, as seemed good in his eyes-by a process almost inconceivable in a critic and littérateur of admitted experience, he liberally interlarded it with long extracts and

VOL. XXVII.—NO. LIIJ.

32

18

SU

pi

Ir

of

pu

th

the

sec

rea

spe

pro

As

pla

bee

wh

tion

Wit Bos

cha

me

var hav

179

issu

cert

of

the

and

well

him

inte

letters from Hawkins, Piozzi, Cumberland, Murphy, and others of Boswell's predecessors and successors, and so turned into an irregular patchwork what the author had left a continuous and methodical design. Furthermore he incorporated with it, among other things, under its date of occurrence, the separate volume of the Tour to the Hebrides, having first polled and trimmed that work according to his taste and fancy. Finally, he added-and this is the least questionable of his acts-an inordinate number of foot-notes. Many of these, it must be conceded, are of the highest value. Penned at a time when memories of Johnson and his contemporaries were still fresh in men's minds, and collected by a writer whose industry and curiosity were as exceptional as his equipment and opportunities, they must always remain an inestimable magazine of Johnsoniana. Their worst fault is that they are more a warehouse than a treasury, and that they exhibit less of literary resource than literary incontinence.

But, if the intrinsic worth of Croker's voluminous annotations has survived the verbal artillery of Macaulay and Carlyle, it has luckily been otherwise with his remodelling of Boswell's text, the principles of which were virtually abandoned in the second edition of 1835. Unfortunately, the execution of this concession to popular opinion was only partial. Although the majority of the passages added to the text were rearranged as foot-notes or dispersed into appendices, the Scotch Tour still upreared itself in the midst as a huge stumbling-block, while the journey to Wales and the letters of Johnson and Mrs. Thrale were still retained. In 1847, when Mr. Croker prepared his definite edition, he continued impenitent to this extent, although he speaks in his 'Advertisement' of abridgment and alteration. Nay, he even acquiesced in the perpetuation of another enormity which dates from the edition of 1835 (an edition which he only partly superintended), the breaking up of the book into chapters. This was a violation of Boswell's plan which can only be described as an act of Vandalism. 'Divisions into books and chapters,' says Mr. Napier, unanswerably (if somewhat grandiloquently), 'are, as it were, articulations in the organic whole of a literary composition; and this special form cannot be superinduced merely externally.' Yet, all these drawbacks to the contrary, Mr. Croker's edition enjoyed a long popularity, and the edition just referred to was reprinted as late as 1876.

It would be beyond the province of this article to trace the post-Crokerian issues of Boswell's book, which, with the exception of an illustrated edition under the superintendence of valu edit title Dr. Robert Carruthers, author of the life of Pope, were mainly

others
I into
inuous
with it,
parate
ed and
inally,
ts—an
nust be
e when
Ill fresh
try and
opporagazine
more a

literary

Oct.

annota-Carlyle, of Bosandoned cution of Ithough irranged ch Tour g-block, ison and . Croker t to this f abridgperpetuadition of ded), the violation an act of says Mr.), 'are, as composied merely trary, Mr. ne edition

le to trace

, with the

endence of

reprints of Malone. But from what has gone before, it will be surmised that the presentation, as far as practicable, of Boswell's unsophisticated text must sooner or later become the ambition of the modern editor. In this praiseworthy enterprise the pioneer appears to have been Mr. Percy Fitzgerald. In May 1874, acting with the encouragement and countenance of the late Mr. Carlyle, to whom his work was dedicated, he published with Messrs. Bickers an edition of Boswell's Life in three volumes, of which the object was to exhibit Boswell's text in its first published form, and at the same time to show the alterations made or contemplated by him in the two subsequent editions with which he was concerned. Thus the reader was enabled to follow the process of revision in the author's mind, and to derive additional satisfaction from the spectacle of the naif and highly ingenuous motives which prompted many of Boswell's rectifications and readjustments. As was inevitable in such a plan, the Tour to the Hebrides was placed by itself at the end, an arrangement which had also been followed by Carruthers; the Diary of a Tour in Wales, which Mr. Croker had turned into chap. xlvi. of his compilation, disappeared altogether; and the interpolated letters knew their place no more. The division into chapters also vanished with the restoration of the original text, which, together with Boswell's spelling, punctuation, paragraphs, and other special characteristics, was religiously preserved. By this arrangement, taken in connexion with the foot-notes exhibiting the variations, the reader was placed in the position of a person having before him at one view the editions of 1791, 1793, and 1799, as well as the separate 'Corrections and Additions' issued by Boswell in 1793. Mr. Fitzgerald also appended certain notes of his own; but, wherever they occurred on the same page as Boswell's work, carefully fenced them by a line of demarcation from what was legitimate Boswell. Upon these notes, generally brief and well chosen, sometimes hasty and ill-considered, it is not needful to dwell. The noticeable characteristic of Mr. Fitzgerald's edition is its loyalty to Boswell, and for that, if for that only, the lovers of Johnson owe him a deep debt of gratitude. We are glad to note that after thirteen years this edition has been reissued, with a new and interesting preface, to which is added, from the Bookseller, the valuable bibliography by Mr. H. R. Tedder, already referred to.

In 1880, six years after the first appearance of the above edition of Boswell's *Life*, Mr. Fitzgerald published, under the title of *Croker's Boswell and Boswell*, a volume which was

188

In

Be

ma

ap

ske

tha

Ma

ful

Uı

an

Ca

the

the

sha

Mr

frag

to

Mr

tion

ske

Art

and

Cui

oth

Dr.

177

sion

bys

tow

pres

Wa

and

repr

hist

of (

Pric

tion

com

suffi

and

the

apparently the outcome of his earlier labours in this field. With the first part of this, which treats mainly of the feud between Macaulay and Croker, and the peculiarities and defects of the latter as an editor, we have no immediate concern. But the second part, which exhibits Boswell at his work, collects much valuable information with respect to his method of note-making, and, with the assistance of the curious memoranda belonging to the late Lord Houghton, published in 1874 by the Grampian Club under the title of Boswelliana, shows how much judicious correction and adroit compression went to produce these 'literary and characteristical anecdotes told with authenticity, and in a lively manner,' which, as Boswell explained to his friend Temple, were to form the staple of his work. Other chapters of equal interest deal with Boswell's strange antipathies and second thoughts, both of which themes, and the former especially, are of no small importance to the minute student of his labours. We have mentioned this book of Mr. Fitzgerald's, because, among the many productions of his rapid pen, it is the one which has always interested us most, and it is obviously, as he declares in his preface, written con amore.

That the reproduction of Boswell neat—to use a convenient vulgarism-had attracted closer attention to the defects of Croker's concoction may be fairly assumed, and the volume just mentioned probably, and certainly among specialists, enforced this impression. Accordingly, in 1884, a new edition of the Life, upon which the editor, the late Rev. Alexander Napier, vicar of Holkham, had been engaged for many years, was issued by Messrs. George Bell and Sons. It was illustrated by facsimiles, steel engravings, and portraits, and was received with considerable, and even, in some quarters, exaggerated, enthusiasm. In this edition the arrangement of Boswell's text was strictly followed, and the tours in Wales and Scotland were printed separately. Many of Croker's notes were withdrawn or abridged, and Mr. Napier, in pursuance of a theory, which is as sound as it is unusual, also omitted all those in which his predecessor had considered it his duty 'to act as censor on Boswell' and even on Johnson himself.

'The editor's duty,' said Mr. Napier, 'is to subordinate himself to his author, and admit that only which elucidates his author's meaning. . . It cannot be the duty of an editor to insult the writer whose book he edits. I confess that the notes of Mr. Croker which most offend are those in which, not seldom, he delights—let me be allowed to use a familiar colloquialism—to snub "Mr. Boswell."

In this deliverance no reasonable reader can fail to concur. Besides the editing of Croker, however, Mr. Napier added many useful notes of his own, as well as some very interesting appendices. One of these reproduces the autobiographical sketch of Johnson prefixed by Richard Wright, of Lichfield, in 1805 to Miss Hill Boothby's letters; another deals with that mysterious History of Prince Titi which figures in Macaulay's review of Croker's first edition; a third successfully dissipates the legendary account of a meeting between Ursa Major and Adam Smith, which represents those 'grave and reverend seignors' as engaged in competitive Billingsgate. Carleton's Memoirs, Theophilus Cibber's Lives of the Poets, and the daughters of Mauritius Lowe are also treated of in this, the newest part of Mr. Napier's labours.

But his edition also includes a valuable supplement in the shape of a volume of Johnsoniana, collected and edited by Mrs. Napier, whose praiseworthy plan is to avoid merely fragmentary 'sayings' and 'anecdotes,' and, as far as possible, to give only complete articles. Thus Mrs. Napier opens with Mrs. Piozzi's book, and then goes on to reprint Hawkins's collection of apophthegms, the Hill-Boothby correspondence, Tyers's sketch from the Gentleman's Magazine, the essay published by Arthur Murphy in 1792 for his edition of Johnson's works, and various recollections and so forth collected from Reynolds, Cumberland, Madame D'Arblay, Hannah More, Percy, and others. But her freshest trouvaille is the diary of a certain Dr. Thomas Campbell, an Irishman who visited England in 1775, and, after the fashion of the time, recorded his impressions. This diary has a curious history. Carried to Australia by some of its writer's descendants, it was peaceably travelling towards dissolution when it was unearthed behind an old press in one of the offices of the Supreme Court of New South In 1854 it was published at Sydney by Mr. Raymond, and from that date until 1884 does not seem to have been reprinted in England. Dr. Campbell had some repute as an historian, and it was he who prepared for Percy the memoir of Goldsmith which, in 1837, was in the possession of Mr. Prior, and formed the first sketch for the straggling compilation afterwards prefixed to the well-known edition of Goldsmith's works dated 1801. Campbell's avowed object in coming to London was to 'see the lions,' and his notes are sufficiently amusing. He lodges at the Grecian Coffee House, and at the Hummums in Covent Garden, where once appeared the ghost of Johnson's dissolute relative, Parson Ford, the

> 'Fortem validumque combibonem Lætantem super amphorâ repletâ'

field.
feud
and
conwork,
ethod
nemoed in
lliana,
ession
cdotes
ich, as

oth of all imhave have he has eclares

m the

l with

a conhe dend the g spe-884, a e Rev. ged for ns. ortraits, uarters, nent of Wales roker's pursual, also dered it

e himself author's he writer er which et me be rell."

ohnson

of Vincent Bourne's hendecasyllabics; he saw Woodward in Hoadly's Suspicious Husband, and Garrick in Lusignan and Lear, in which latter character Dr. Campbell, contradicting all received tradition, considered 'he could not display himself.' He went to the auction-rooms in the Piazza; he went to the Foundling and the Temple and Dr. Dodd's Chapel; he went to Ranelagh and the Pantheon, where he watched those lapsed lovers, Lady Grosvenor and the Duke of Cumberland, carefully avoiding each other. He dined often at Thrale's, meeting Boswell and Baretti, and Murphy and Johnson. With the great man he was not impressed, and his portrait affords an example of Johnson as he struck an unsympathetic contemporary. According to Dr. Campbell this was his picture:—

'He has the aspect of an Idiot, without the faintest ray of sense gleaming from any one feature-with the most awkward garb, and unpowdered grey wig, on one side only of his head-he is for ever dancing the devil's jig, and sometimes he makes the most driveling effort to whistle some thought in his absent paroxisms. He came up to me and took me by the hand, then sat down upon a sofa, and mumbled out that he had heard two papers had appeared against him in the course of this week-one of which was-that he was to go to Ireland next summer in order to abuse the hospitality of that place also [a reference to the recently published Journey to the Western Islands]. His awkwardness at table is just what Chesterfield described, and his roughness of manners kept pace with that. When Mrs. Thrale quoted something from Foster's "Sermons" he flew in a passion, and said that Foster was a man of mean ability, and of no original thinking. All which tho' I took to be most true, yet I held it not meet to have it so set down.'

From this it will be perceived that Dr. Campbell was of those who identified the 'respectable Hottentot' of Chesterfield's letters with the 'great Lexicographer,' an identification which Dr. Birkbeck Hill, in *Dr. Johnson: His Friends and His Critics*,

has successfully shown to be untenable.

Towards the close of 1884 Mr. Napier's edition was reissued in the 'Standard Library,' making six small volumes, in which some only of the portrait illustrations of the first issue were reproduced. The chief addition consisted of a series of letters from Boswell to his friend Sir David Dalrymple. Extracts from this very interesting correspondency, bearing upon Boswell's first acquaintance with his Mentor, had appeared in the volume of Boswelliana already mentioned, but they had been but extracts. Mr. Napier gave the letters in extenso. Two years later Professor Henry Morley pub-

fea edi ess be bei has whi elal fess ind gen

the

exc

188

lisl

fac

he

Pro

Bos It is that him real bibli whice Boss brin by I Pres chor

Fitzs hill His whice for the speal source of a

Ersk

sump

ship

VIIM

and g all self.' the went speed care-eting a the fords shetic s his

Oct.

sense b, and or ever tweling time up fa, and against s to go t place Western eld de-When flew in d of no c, yet I

f those rfield's which Critics, was re-

chorus of praise.

was reblumes, ne first d of a d Dalndence, Mentor, ationed, letters y published, in five exceedingly handsome volumes, what, from the fact of its decoration by portraits from the brush of Sir Joshua, he christened the 'Reynolds' edition. In common with all Professor Morley's work, the editing of this issue was thoroughly straightforward and sensible. A new and noticeable feature was the prefixing to each of the prefaces of the different editors a succinct account of the writer. At the end came an essay entitled the 'Spirit of Johnson,' to which can scarcely be denied the merit which a recent critic has claimed for it of being 'one of the best descriptions of Johnson's character that has ever been written.' There were also elaborate indices, of which one can only say in their dispraise that they were less elaborate than that prepared by the editor who follows Professor Morley. Like Mr. Napier, Mr. Morley was largely indebted to Croker, and like Mr. Napier he freely pruned that gentleman's luxuriance.

Lieut.-Colonel Francis Grant's excellent little memoir in the 'Great Writers' series deserves mention, because, although exceedingly unpretentious, it is the work of one who, to borrow Boswell's epithet for Malone, is certainly 'Johnsonianissimus.' It is impossible to turn his anecdotical pages without seeing that he is steeped in the literature of the period, and that, for him, the personages of the Boswellian drama have all the reality of living friends. His volume, too, includes a valuable bibliography by Mr. John P. Anderson of Johnson's works, which, in point of time, preceded the special bibliography of Boswell's Life in Mr. Fitzgerald's new edition. And this brings us to the last work on our list, the sumptuous edition by Dr. G. Birkbeck Hill, issued in 1887 from the Clarendon Press, a work which has been received with an almost universal

That Dr. Hill's book is 'un livre de bonne foi' there can indeed be little doubt. He is well known as a devoted worshipper at Johnson's shrine. He has been for years a persistent reviewer of books on this subject (especially Mr. Fitzgerald's), and his essays (collected in 1878 from the Cornhill and other periodicals under the title of Dr. Johnson: His Friends and His Critics) bear that unmistakable stamp which denotes the writer who has not crammed his subject for the purpose of preparing an article, but who has, so to speak, let the article write itself out of the fulness of his resources. Besides these he edited, in 1879, Boswell's Journal of a Tour in Corsica and his correspondence with Andrew Erskine. But he has crowned his former labours by this sumptuous edition with its excellent typography, its handsome

W

a

th

ŀ

SI

de

p

W

be

is

H

R

ho

th

th

ha

tra W

olo

su

pas

Ih the

Ru

at

page, and its exhaustive index, which last, we can well believe. must have cost him, as he says, 'many months' heavy work.' That he himself executed this 'sublunary task,' as a recent writer has described it, is matter for congratulation; that he has also verified it page by page in proof almost entitles him to a Montyon prize for exceptional literary virtue. Our only regret is that his 'Preface' is touched a little too strongly with the sense of his unquestioned industry and conscientiousness. However legitimate it may be, the public is always somewhat intolerant of the superbia quæsita meritis. Moreover, it is an extremely difficult thing to display judiciously, and, after all, as Carlyle said of Croker's efforts, the editing of Boswell is 'a

praiseworthy but no miraculous procedure.'

This note of self-gratulation in Dr. Birkbeck Hill's introductory words is, however, but a trifling drawback when contrasted with the real merits of a work which, in these days of piping-hot publication, has much of the leisurely grace of eighteenth-century scholarship. The labour-not only the labour of which the result remains on record, but that bloomless and fruitless labour with which everyone who has been engaged in editorial drudgery can sympathise-must have been unprecedented. Nothing could be more ungracious than to smear the petty blot of an occasional inaccuracy across the wide field which has been explored so observantly—certainly it could not be the desire of those who have ever experienced the multiplied chances of error involved by transcription, press correction, revision, and re-revision. At the same time we frankly own that we think Dr. Birkbeck Hill's edition has not escaped a dangerous defect of its qualities. It unquestionably errs on the side of excess. 'I have sought,' he says, 'to follow him [Johnson] wherever a remark of his required illustration, and have read through many a book that I might trace to its source a reference or an allusion.' And he has no doubt been frequently very fortunate, notably in his identification of the quotation which Johnson made when he heard the Highland girl of Nairne singing at her spinning-wheel, in his solution of 'loplolly,' and in half a dozen similar cases. But, as regards 'remarks that require illustration,' there are manifestly two methods, the moderate and the immoderate. By the one nothing but such reference or elucidation as explains the text is admissible; by the other anything that can possibly be connected with it is drawn into its train, and the motley notes tread upon each other's heels much as, in the fairy tale, the three girls, the parson, and the sexton follow the fellow with the golden goose. To the latter of these methods rather than

Oct.

elieve.

work.

recent hat he

es him

ir only

y with

usness.

newhat

it is an

fter all,

ell is 'a

ll's in-

when

se days

race of

aly the

bloom-

as been

st have

ous than

ross the

ertainly

erienced

n, press

ime we

has not

tionably

o follow

stration,

ce to its

ibt been

n of the

Iighland

lution of

regards

the one

the text

be con-

ey notes

tale, the

low with

her than

the former Dr. Birkbeck Hill 'seriously inclines,' and almost any portion of his book would serve to supply a case in point. Take, for instance, the note at p. 269, vol. i., to the verse which Boswell quotes from Garrick's Ode on Mr. Pelham:—

'The same sad morn, to Church and State (So for our sins 'twas fix'd by fate)
A double stroke was given;
Black as the whirlwinds of the North,
St. John's fell genius issued forth,
And Pelham fled to heaven.'

Neither Malone nor Croker has any note upon this, and as Boswell himself tells us that Pelham died on the day on which Mallet's edition of Lord Bolingbroke's works came out, and as the first line of his paragraph gives the exact date of the event, it is difficult to see what ground, and certainly what pressing need, there could be for further comment. Yet Dr. Hill has no less than four 'illustrations.' First he tells us, from Walpole's letters, that Pelham died of a surfeit. suggests another quotation from Johnson himself about the death of Pope, which introduces the story of the potted lampreys. Then comes a passage from Fielding's Journal of a Voyage to Lisbon to the effect that he (Fielding) was at his worst when Pelham died. Lastly comes a second quotation from Walpole, this time from his George II., in which we are told that the king said he should now 'have no more peace,' because Pelham was dead. The recondite erudition of all this is incontestable, but its utility is more than doubtful. Dr. Hill's method is seen more serviceably at work in a note on Reynolds's visit to Devonshire in 1762. First we get a record how Northcote, 'with great satisfaction to his mind,' touched the skirt of Sir Joshua's coat, and this quite naturally recalls the well-known anecdote how Reynolds himself in his youth had grasped the hand of the great Mr. Pope at Christie's. The transition to Pope's own visit as a boy of twelve to Dryden at Will's Coffee House thus becomes an easy one. 'Who touched old Northcote's hand?' says Dr. Hill. 'Has the apostolic succession been continued?' and then he goes on to add:

'Since writing these lines I have read with pleasure the following passage in Mr. Ruskin's *Præterita*, chap. i. p. 16: "When at three and a half I was taken to have my portrait painted by Mr. Northcote, I had not been ten minutes alone with him before I asked him why there were holes in his carpet." Dryden, Pope, Reynolds, Northcote, Ruskin, so runs the chain of genius, with only one weak link in it.'

This is an excellent specimen of the concatenated process at the best. We are bound to add that there are many as

XUM

good. We are also bound to admit that the examples of its abuse are by no means obtrusive. Dr. Birkbeck Hill, in short, has done his work thoroughly. His appendices—e.g. those on Johnson's Debates in Parliament and on George Psalmanazar—are practically exhaustive, and he has left no stone unturned in his labour of interpretation. If in the result of that labour there is something of 'surplusage,' to use a word which Croker, with mock humility, applied to his own efforts, it must also be conceded that Boswell's famous book has never before been annotated with equal learning, industry, and enthusiasm.

ART. VIII.—THE APOCRYPHA.

The Holy Bible according to the Authorized Version (A.D. 1611), with an Explanatory and Critical Commentary, and a Revision of the Translation by Clergy of the Anglican Church. 'Apocrypha;' edited by HENRY WACE, D.D., in two volumes. (London, 1888.)

SINCE the article on the Apocrypha appeared in the Church Quarterly Review of January 1881, much has been done to bring within the reach of English readers such information as is accessible on the subject of the 'Biblical Apocrypha,' and of the kindred Jewish literature which modern research has brought to light. In the volumes before us we have the subject treated in a fuller and a more exhaustive way than in any previous work in our language. The authors seem to have spared no efforts to render the subject interesting and attractive, and to bring to bear upon it the results of modern research—antiquarian, geographical, historical, and Rabbinical. The Speaker's Commentary will probably succeed better in drawing attention to the Apocrypha than Dr. Bissell's laborious but somewhat dry production, published in 1880, uniformly with Lange's Commentary on the Old Testament. has been followed by those of Dr. Neubauer on Tobit, by Mr. Deane's careful commentary on Wisdom, and a series of articles by the same author in the Expositor and Monthly Interpreter; whilst less advanced students have found their wants supplied by the Commentary of the Christian Knowledge Society, and the Uncanonical Scriptures published by Mr. White works Solon Barul or in Thus

1888

view, litera and t T Book Biblio tion, has b to the of th books clude and I sions Chris inclu there addit the a the 1 Coun not ea in the hardl sacre as the as the him based Chur it su

not e

accep

Greel

to the

to the

agree

1611),

a Re-

vledge y Mr.

Whitaker in 1884. Outside the Biblical Apocrypha such works as the Book of Enoch, the little Genesis, the Psalter of Solomon, the Book of Adam and Eve, and the Apocalypse of Baruk, have received due attention, either in separate treatises or in articles devoted to them in dictionaries or periodicals. Thus a large field of study and enquiry has been opened to view, having a close affinity to the later Jewish and Rabbinical literature, and yet differing from it in many of its features and tendencies

Baruk, have received due attention, either in separate treatises or in articles devoted to them in dictionaries or periodicals. Thus a large field of study and enquiry has been opened to view, having a close affinity to the later Jewish and Rabbinical literature, and yet differing from it in many of its features and tendencies. The Biblical Apocrypha stands distinguished from the Books of the Hebrew Canon on the one side and the extra-Biblical Apocrypha on the other. Of the two lines of distinction, the first is more clearly drawn than the second. has been no distinct uniform rule in the Christian Church as to the classification of the uncanonical books; some collections of the ancient Scriptures including books and portions of books which were not found in others; some, which were excluded from the Vulgate, being found both in the old Greek and Latin editions; some being added to Polyglotts and versions which had no place in either. The traditions of the Christian Church appear to be as favourable to portions not included in the Tridentine Canon as to the books which were there enumerated, especially to the 151st Psalm, and the other

hurch. n two additions to the Psalter, including the Prayer of Manasses; Church the additions to Proverbs, the preface to Lamentations, and one to the Fourth Book of Esdras, whilst the preference by the ion as Council of Trent of the Greek Esther to the Greek Esdras is a,' and not easily explained. The exclusion of certain books contained h has in the old Latin version from the newly-defined Canon was e subhardly consistent with the words: 'If any one receive not as in any sacred and canonical the said books entire with all their parts o have as they have been used to be read in the Catholic Church and attracas they are contained in the old Latin Vulgate edition . . . let ern rehim be anathema.'1 The probable origin of the Canon as inical. based upon a supposed Greek authority, was discussed in the ter in Church Quarterly Review of January 1881. The upholders of orious it supposed (erroneously) that the Prayer of Manasses was formly not extant in Greek. But the strangest inconsistency lay in work accepting as canonical Jerome's dislocated fragments of the y Mr. Greek Esther and rejecting the Greek Esdras, whose relation f artito the Hebrew Ezra closely resembled the relation of the other Interto the Hebrew Esther. Dr. Salmon, in his able introduction, wants agrees with the view taken in the Church Quarterly Review,

¹ Swete, Handbook of the Roman Catholic Controversy, p. 3.

January 1881 (p. 327), that the aim at the Council was to give canonical authority to certain passages which had been much used in the controversies of the period rather than to bring the books as a whole into new prominence:—

'The majority of the Council, being men who took much more interest in the polemical discussions of their own day than in learned research as to the opinions of early times, were mainly induced to give so high a rank to the Apocrypha by the controversial use to be made of a few texts in it' (Tob. xii. 12, 15; 2 Macc. xv. 12-14, xii. 44, 45).

Under the head of 'Deutero-canonical Books' the relations of the Anglican and Roman Church on this question were fully treated by Dr. Pusey in the third part of the *Eirenicon*, pp. 122–157. He observes that the Homilies of the English Church seem to concede an inferior kind of inspiration to Tobit, Wisdom, and Ecclesiasticus.

'We retain the Canon of St. Jerome and the distinction which he draws between the books of the Old Testament, upon which our Lord expressly set His seal; yet both books of Homilies, in some forty-three places in all, quote, either in the body of the Homily or in the margin, the Deutero-canonical Books. They quote them as "Scripture writh the by the Holy Ghost," "the Scriptures," "the Old Testament," with the formula, "it is written," as "the Word of God," "the infallible and undeceivable Word of God." They quote them, together with other Scripture and under the same formula, even together with words of our Lord Himself. . . . And whereas the Deutero-canonical Books are quoted so often in the Homilies, it is remarkable that amid the copious quotations from Holy Scripture in the Council of Trent one place only is quoted from them, and that only upon a matter of practice' (Tobit i. 6, with other Scripture, 'that the payment of tithes is owed to God,' Sess. xxv. c. 12).

Dr. Swete (England versus Rome, p. 18) observes 'that Du Pin was willing to accept for the Apocryphal books the title "Deutero-canonical," thereby contravening the plain language of the Council of Trent, and exposing himself to its anathema.' This is, however, giving a sense to the word 'Deutero-canonical' which was not avowed by its authors. Their Deutero-canon was of later authorization, not of inferior authority, as Dr. Salmon rightly observes (p. xxxiii.). It is a further question whether the writers of the Biblical Apocrypha claim anything like inspired authority; indeed, whether they do not emphatically disclaim it. There is no claim of prophetic inspiration; no declaration like 'Thus saith the Lord,' 'Hear the word of the Lord,' even where, as in Baruch, the language of the Hebrew prophets is paraphrased and applied. The authors write as pious Israelites, with their minds stored with the teaching of

Sin the promet the who was nati

cla

18

the

ist

the Isr cor in The and refl fitti

XV.

is w

connand The mag ascri who word Apo as m

featr of V 'Pse not l of t Psal and Judi 'alle

write

141

1888

ch more learned d to give e made 44, 45). elations re fully p. 122-

Church it, Wis-

which he our Lord rty-three margin, e written with the lible and ith other words of al Books amid the rent one r of practithes is

es 'that the title anguage athema.' anonical' anon was Salmon whether g like inhatically tion; no rd of the Hebrew write as aching of

the Hebrew Scriptures, and applying that teaching to the existing circumstances and hopes of their nation. The son of Sirach only professes to be a gleaner and a collector of the thoughts and sayings of others (Ecclus. xxxiii. 16, 17). The prevailing language is that of prayer to God, not of prophecy or message from God. In hard times of sore national affliction the authors exhort their fellow-countrymen to seek the mercy which the ancient law assured to them if they sought it by the way of repentance. However much they may exalt their nation or minimize their faults, nothing is said in praise of themselves; there are no pretensions to superior wisdom or claims of a personal nature. If they are teachers of truth to the world, it is only as possessing in common with the rest of Israel the deposit of the Divine Law. This modesty is most conspicuous in the book chiefly selected for controversial use in the Reformation period, the Second Book of Maccabees. The author professes to compile his narrative from certain letters and documents, which he intersperses with pious and patriotic reflections of his own: 'And if I have done well, and as is fitting the story, it is that which I desired: but if slenderly and meanly, it is that which I could attain unto' (2 Macc. xv. 38).

Another objection to the 'inspiration' of the Apocrypha is well stated by Dr. Salmon (p. xxxiv.):-

'It necessitates a low theory of Inspiration. . . . It is intimately connected with the question how much is meant by the inspiration and authority ascribed to the books of the Hebrew Old Testament. The two classes of books can be put on the same level, either by magnifying the authority ascribed to the former, or depressing that ascribed to the latter. The rationalistic critic of the present day, who does not ascribe inspiration, as the Church understands the word, to any books, has no inclination to set the Books of the Apocrypha in any inferior position. Jewish literature of one age has as many claims on his regard as Jewish literature of another.'

We are thankful to Dr. Salmon for giving prominence to this feature of the controversy. The 'Pseudo-Solomon' of the Book of Wisdom is by recent 'results' placed on a level with the 'Pseudo-Solomon' of Ecclesiastes or the 'Deutero-Isaiah.' not by the exaltation of the former, but by the disparagement of the latter; the so-called 'post-exilic' and 'Maccabean' Psalms will naturally come to be classed with the Prayers and Hymns of the Apocrypha. The 'fables' of Tobit and Judith will not be more unhistorical than the myths and 'allegories' of the Pentateuch, if the views of some recent writers obtain general acceptance. To such theorists there

F

W

n

d

10

L

b

CC

as

lin

clu

Stu

ce

att

are

his

apo

in

Ch

Th

ho

M

bir

lat

ex

fita

seems to be nothing preposterous in making the simple narrative of events a later development, and regarding the 'myth' as the original form of human records, although we find in the earliest writings which have come down to us a series of genealogies and accounts reaching back to the beginning of the human race. The legends of the Apocrypha can hardly be alleged in support of such theories. Here the 'allegory' is based upon history, and is not a mere creation of poetic fancy. Historical events are embellished, imaginary names are introduced, circumstances are added, and thus some moral suited to the times of the writer is inculcated from a story which disguises the present in the garb of the past. Thus the story or tradition of the three youths at the court of Darius in the Greek Esdras is taken to illustrate the maxim, 'The truth is great and will prevail,' the frame of the picture being a cento of extracts from the Canonical Scriptures. The author's object is not to hand down an accurate record of events, but to inculcate some esoteric teaching. But this kind of writing implies an historical basis. The Apocryphal writers took the ancient books of the Hebrew Canon as their chief source of ideas. they assume their authority, they abound in quotations and 'reminiscences' of the sacred text. Their later and inferior kind of writing is most valuable as a testimony to the Hebrew Scriptures. From Genesis to Malachi every part finds its recognition in the Biblical Apocrypha. Without the aid of the Law and Prophets they could not have constructed their stories and allegories, or framed their prayers and instructions, their hymns and praises. On these grounds we deprecate as superficial and inadequate the following remarks on the Song of the Three Holy Children, vol. ii. p. 307:

'Many expositors of Scripture . . . conspicuously lack that orientation which is an indispensable preliminary to a right understanding of the treasures of Eastern thought; I mean the inveterate tendency of Jewish teachers to convey their doctrine not in the form of abstract discourse, but in a mode appealing directly to the imagination, and seeking to rouse the interest and sympathy of the man rather than the philosopher. The Rabbi embodies his lesson in a story, whether parable or allegory, or seeming historical narrative; and the last thing he or his disciples would think of is to ask whether the selected persons, events, and circumstances which so vividly suggest the doctrine are in themselves real or fictitious.'

If the Apocryphal narratives were mere Arabian Nights or Æsop's Fables, their presence within the sacred volume could not be defended. But if, though inferior to *inspired Scriptures*, they are truly *scriptural*, inculcating the moral lessons which

143

1888

le narmyth' find in eries of ning of hardly legory' poetic names e moral a story hus the arius in e truth a cento s object o inculimplies ancient f ideas, ons and inferior Hebrew inds its e aid of ed their uctions.

t orientaanding of ndency of abstract tion, and ther than , whether e selected ggest the

ecate as

he Song

lights or me could criptures, ns which the Scriptures inculcate, and expressing the belief of the writers in the authenticity of the Scripture narratives, and the reality of the persons whose names and actions they derive from Scripture, the Apocrypha is truly a margin to the great historical revelation of the Old Testament, and a witness to it. The Books of Wisdom and Ecclesiasticus thus testify to a very large part of the sacred history, beginning with the creation of the world, the life of Adam the protoplast, the personality of the Tempter, the Fall and the repentance after the Fall. the Deluge, the Tower of Babel, and the call of Abraham. Where allegorical applications are introduced, as in the Fourth Book of Esdras, the historical reality of the persons who are taken as types is assumed. The Egyptian darkness is made the type of Tartarus or hell; but the basis of the application is the literal narrative of the plagues of Egypt. deliverance of the three Jewish princes from the fiery furnace loses none of its historical reality by becoming a type of the Divine preservation of all Israel in the furnace of affliction. kept from ruin by the presence of Him 'Who dwelt in the bush,' and gave it that vitality which the power of the enemy could not destroy. The theory which regards the Apocrypha as a mere handful out of a mass of Rabbinical literature destroys all the rationale of its inclusion in the sacred volume. or of the Commentary on the Bible being extended to it.

The distinction between the Biblical and extra-Biblical Apocrypha is correctly given in the Introduction, p. xlii.:

'It is the Christian use of the Apocrypha which accounts for the limitation of the contents of the present volumes. The writings included in them are not the only pre-Christian writings which may be studied with advantage in order to trace the religious progress of the Jewish people. Some materials for the study have indeed only recently come to light. The Book of Enoch has special claims on our attention; and there are some of the so-called Sibylline verses which are certainly pre-Christian, and which may be used to illustrate the history of Messianic expectations. . . . But whatever acceptance other apocrypha may have met with in Jewish circles, the books included in the present volumes have enjoyed a consideration in the Christian Church to which no others can lay claim.'

These excellent remarks in the Introduction, however, raise hopes which are not altogether realized in the Commentary. Most of the authors give a great preponderance to the Rabbinical over the Patristic element in their notes. In some the latter element is almost evanescent, whilst they revel in an exuberance of Rabbinic illustration, more curious than profitable, and somewhat wearisome to the student, who is left to

search for a few rare grains of wheat in the midst of these mountains of chaff. Mr. Lupton and Mr. Fuller have given fuller recognition to the Fathers of the Christian Church than the other commentators; but throughout the volumes very little is said of the liturgical use of the Apocrypha. the Introduction the Reformed English Prayer Book is said to have included lessons from the Apocrypha in its Lectionary; but little is said of the extensive use made of it in the ancient offices of the Church; of the Fourth Book of Esdras (or its later additions) in the Commemoration of Martyrs; of the prayers of Judith in the Liturgies of St. Mark and St. Basil; of Tobit in the Itinerarium; of Tobit, Judith and Maccabees in the Lectionary of the Autumnal Breviary; of the Epistle of Jeremias in the Commemoration of the Angels; of Wisdom in the Pentecostal Offices; of Ecclus. xxiv. in all the Offices of our Lady; or of the very ancient use of the Song of the Three and the Prayer of Manasses as Canticles, of which the evidence is seen in their inclusion in the appendix to the Greek Psalter. Little is said of the influence of Wisdom upon the Alexandrian fathers, or of the application of its teaching about the manna to the Eucharist, both in homiletic and liturgical use. The Rabbinical sphere of illustration has a strange fascination for the Biblical commentators of the day. The time may come when the Christian aspect of these books will again claim a fuller attention.

One remarkable feature of the Biblical Apocrypha is the absence of such anticipations of the office and work of the Messiah as might have been expected from devout readers of Hebrew prophecy. It seems to illustrate, not the attitude of Simeon and Anna, and the faithful remnant who were waiting for the kingdom of God, but rather that of the Jewish rulers who 'knew Him not, nor yet the voices of the prophets which are read every Sabbath day '(Acts xiii. 27). The roll of prophecy was a sealed book, the true hidden meaning of the ancient law was waiting to be revealed by a new light of supernatural origin. Even in this dimness of perception of Divine truth an evidence is furnished of the truth of the Gospel as a new revelation. It could be no development of such Jewish thought as we find in the Apocrypha.1 We find here a remarkable absence of any basis for the speculations of Strauss, 'that the Gospels originated in a transference into the history of Jesus of the Jewish expectations of the Messiah,

so no Je fai

of

th

pi

(6

D

wr dre be Ol the

is a find and ma (vo

Go

Wi

tile Pa who Good the Is

very
the
φιλ
hati
sons
the

be l com 22,

obse

MIIX

¹ The attempt of Dean Plumptre to trace in the Epistle to the Hebrews a development of the teaching of the Book of Wisdom must be regarded as a failure. See Dr. Farrar's remarks in vol. i. pp. 413, 414.

these given hurch lumes a. In s said onary; ncient (or its of the Basil; cabees Epistle /isdom fices of of the ch the to the

n upon

eaching

tic and

has a

Oct.

he day. books a is the of the readers attitude re wait-Jewish the pro-7). The neaning ew light rception h of the ment of We find ulations

le to the n must be 13, 414.

nce into

Messiah,

those expectations being grounded on the Old Testament prophecies and types and their current interpretations' (Church Quarterly Review, 1888, p. 97). Upon this subject Dr. Farrar's remarks in the Introduction to Wisdom deserve special attention:-

'In the Book of Wisdom, as in Ecclesiasticus, there is no personal and no suffering Messiah. The Messianic hope has come to mean nothing but the dominance of Israel and the universal worship of Jehovah (Wisd. iii. 8; v. 16; viii. 14). Mention is made indeed of "a faithful prophet," in I Macc. xiv. 41; but on the whole the Advent of a Divine Deliverer of the tribe of David has been merged by the writers of the Apocrypha, as by Philo, into a vast incoherent dream (vol. i. p. 410). . . . The author of Wisdom not only falls behind the writers of the New, but even below the prophets of the Old Testament, in the fact that he seems wholly to have lost sight of the hope of a personal Messiah ' (vol. i. p. 414).

Dr. Edersheim observes similarly on Ecclus. xxiv.:-

'The older Church writers regarded this personification of Wisdom as the Christ. But the vital difference of thought in Ecclus. is apparent from the following verses (see especially verse 9). We find here not the beginnings of Christianity, but of Alexandrianism; and the personification (?) or rather distinction of Wisdom as God manifesting Himself, points forward to Philo, not to the Gospels' (vol. ii. p. 126).

This remarkable failure of the Jews in the preparation for the Gospel brings into greater prominence the share of the Gentiles in the work. With their poetry and philosophy for their 'Pædagogue' they were approaching to truths which those who had the advantage of the possession of the oracles of God failed to apprehend. 'What then? are we better than they? No, in no wise. Is He the God of the Jews only? Is He not also of the Gentiles? Yes, of the Gentiles also' (Rom. iii. 9, 29).

On the other hand, the writers of the Apocrypha show a very deep sense of the Fatherly love and care of God for all the souls which He hath made. In Wisdom God is the φιλόψυχος, and His Holy Spirit is the πνεθμα φιλάνθρωπον. hating nothing that He has made. Through Israel as His sons God purposed to give the uncorrupt light of the law to the world (Wisd. xviii. 4). This light was a treasure, not to be hoarded up and concealed (Ecclus. xx. 30, 31), but to be communicated freely without envy or grudging (Wisd. vi. 22, 23). On the first of these passages Dr. Farrar rightly observes (vol. i. 525):-

VOL. XXVII.—NO. LIII.

(1

pa

th

as

th

OU

vi.

na

the

of

Th

as

ide

ene

wh

out

pui

(an

dre

(W

vin

ten

guie

den

than

the

whi

spac

in w

espe

Nur

the i

on th

the v

theis

on th

the :

the c

Gen.

tion,

'Here, as in the song of Simeon (Luke ii. 32), we find the distinct conception that ultimately "the law" was not to be confined to the Jew only, but was to be "a light to lighten the Gentiles" (comp. xiv. 13). It is strange that the scribes of our Lord's day, and the people under their teaching, should so completely have lost sight of the old prophecies of the universal conversion of the heathen (Isa. ii. 1-5, xxvii. 13; Mic. iv. 1-13). Comp. Tobit xiii. 11, "A clear light shall shine to all the ends of the earth;" id. xiv. 6, "And all the nations which are in the whole earth will turn and fear God truly, and will forsake their idols."

Dr. Edersheim in his notes on Ecclus. xxiv. (vol. ii. 127) connects this thought with the legend in the Talmud that the law had been offered to, and refused by, every nation before it was accepted by Israel on Mount Sinai: 1—

'Possibly the legend represents a survival of the fundamental thought of Alexandrianism, or rather of that more free thinking which in Palestine itself formed the root and source of what afterwards was developed in Jewish Hellenism as the idea of an original share of all mankind in that highest Wisdom which found its full expression in the Law.'

On the other hand, the Book of Baruch dwells on the exclusive privileges of Israel which were not to be found with the princes of the heathen, the Agarenes, Themanites, &c. (Bar. iii. 15, &c.) Even here, however, there are traces of the thought that Israel had received the law that they might be the guides and teachers of the nations. Dr. Edersheim calls special attention to Ecclus. xliv. 22, 'With Isaac did He establish the blessing of all men, and the covenant.' Here the son of Sirach adopts the received rendering of Gen. xxii. 18, in opposition to the confident assertion of modern critics that the correct translation is, 'With thy seed shall all the nations of the earth bless themselves.' So in Ecclus. xxxvi. 14–17, the prayer that God would fill Sion with His unspeakable oracles, and raise up prophets, is in order that 'all they which dwell upon the earth may know that Thou art the Lord, the eternal God.'

The repeated assertions of the Apocryphal writers of the peculiar favour shown by God to Israel are mostly paraphrases or 'reminiscences' of portions of the Canonical Scriptures, and should not be pressed against them as implying unworthy conceptions of the God of all, with Whom there is no respect of persons. The same writers speak with no less emphasis of 'the mercy of the Lord which is upon all flesh'

¹ Compare also the Targum of Jonathan on Deut. xxxiii. 2. On the theory of a pre-Mosaic revelation see *Christian Remembrancer*, vol. xl. pp. 431-450.

1888

to the (comp. nd the sight of (Isa. ii. ear light all the uly, and

7) connat the before

lamental ng which ards was are of all ession in

xclusive vith the cc. (Bar. of the night be eim calls did He Here the kii. 18, in that the ations of 4-17, the e oracles, well upon nal God.' ers of the tly paracal Scripimplying n there is th no less all flesh'

2. On the

(Ecclus. xviii. 13), for 'as His Majesty is, so is His mercy' (Ecclus. ii. 18; Wisd. xi. 23). Israel is exhorted to be patient under the heaviest chastisements, by the reflection that they might have been treated with far greater severity. as in the case of other nations who had been left to fill up the measure of their iniquity, and had then been cut off without warning (Judith viii. 26, 27; Ecclus. xvii. 18, 21; 2 Macc. vi. 14, 17). Dr. Farrar says, 'It is impossible not to see the narrowness of Jewish pride and particularism in the assumption that all the trials which befell the Israelites were only the outcome of fatherly tenderness, whereas the misfortunes of the Egyptians were the result of their guilt and God's severity,' taking exception especially to the words 'These Thou didst admonish and try as a Father; but the other, as a severe King, Thou didst condemn and punish.' The leading idea is, however, not a vindictive feeling towards Israel's enemies, but rather to insist upon the mercy in judgment which Israel experienced, which the author of Wisdom brings out by a series of elaborate antitheses. His moral is also a pure and elevating one: 'that the just man should be merciful (an imitator of the Divine philanthropy), and that God's children should be of good hope that He gives repentance for sins' Such a moral contrasts favourably with the (Wisd. xii. 19). vindictive fanaticism which the study of the Apocalypse has tended to foster in the minds of many Christians; with no guidance but that of the law which was a ministration of condemnation the author had a juster view of the Divine mercy than those whose faith in the Gospel was overshadowed by theories of arbitrary decrees and reprobation.

There are many other questions of importance and interest which arise out of the study of the Apocrypha, into which our space forbids us to enter: such are the doctrine of Creation, in which the Apocrypha offers points of contact with Philo, especially with respect to the Divine Wisdom, the Mother and Nurse of all things, by Whom the universe was perfected; on the nature of angels and demons; on the personality of Satan; on the future life and the state of the dead; on the torments of the wicked; on the origin of idolatry and the developed polytheism of Alexandria; on Platonism and the anima mundi; on the points of contact between Judaism and Stoicism; on the moral precepts of prayer, fasting, and almsgiving; and

the care of the bodies of the dead.

The doctrine of sin, or human corruption, the יצר הרע of Gen. vi. 5, appears in Ecclus. xxxvii. 3, 'O wicked imagination, whence comest thou in to cover the earth with deceit?'

C

I

L

SE

la

of

CC

pa

or

Ps

inc

of

of

per

illu

tio

of a

lon

Chi

ma

the

Eas

of

espe

the

Lap

Dio

a wo

has

quar

sugg

The

Jame

tian i

in th

and xvii. 16, 'Every man from his youth is given to evil; neither could they make to themselves fleshy hearts for stony.' The latter verse is supposed to be a Christian interpolation, though it expresses Old Testament teaching, and connects the 'heart of stone' in Ezekiel with the אים אים הרעו Gen. vi. In a note on Ecclus. xxv. 24 Dr. Edersheim says, 'This verse is remarkable, as ascribing to Eve not only the introduction of death, but also the commencement, although not the introduction, of sin. . . . But we must be careful not to identify the statement that "of woman came the beginning of sin" with the N.T. doctrine of original sin.' The evil propensity from childhood was noted by the Rabbins (see Bartoloccius, Bibliotheca, vol. ii.), but not (according to Dr. Edersheim) the inherited taint.

It is difficult to embrace within the limits of a single article a fair estimate of the labours of the learned contributors to these volumes, each of whom furnishes material for so much thought and discussion. The Rev. J. H. Lupton has annotated very thoroughly the least attractive portion, the Third Book of Esdras, with its corrupt version of long extracts from the Canonical Books of Ezra and Nehemiah, and its long catalogues of proper names. The legend of the three youths he regards as a curious episode, resembling the account of the Seventy Interpreters in the history of Aristeas. The far more interesting Fourth Book of Esdras is less fully annotated, though its character and its relations to the Book of Enoch and other Apocalypses might have entitled it to a more exhaustive treatment. Mr. Fuller has done full justice to the Book of Tobit, including the additional matter in the Vulgate, Syriac, and Hebrew editions of the story. excursuses and appendices are rich in illustrative matter. The commentary of Bede and the use of the book by the canonists also obtain a due share of notice. Mr. Ball, who comments on Judith and the additions to Daniel, is even more diffuse, especially in his Rabbinical illustrations. His commentary has done for these portions of the Apocrypha what Professor Neubauer did for Tobit. In common with the majority of the contributors he pleads for a Semitic or Oriental origin for the chief part of the Apocrypha, though it has descended to us in a Greek or Alexandrian form. The elders in Susanna are traced to the false prophets, Ahab and Zedekiah, in Babylon, and the story is compared with the strange Rabbinical legend concerning them. Even the paronomasia of the trees (σχίνος, πρίνος, σχίσαι, πρίσαι) is supposed to be based upon a similar one in Chaldee or Syriac; evil;

stony.

olation,

onnects

Gen. vi.

1888

is verse duction e introtify the n" with tv from oloccius, eim) the a single ned conmaterial Lupton portion, of long ehemiah, nd of the bling the Aristeas. less fully the Book ed it to a ull justice ter in the ory. The

ed it to a ull justice ter in the ory. The re matter, both by the Ball, who even more His compypha what with the femitic or ha, though the same of the entity of the entit

and the writer's object is taken to be the reform of judicial proceedings, and not the one indicated in the Septuagint, the recognition of the virtues of the young as contrasted with the inveterate vices of their elders. In the notes on Bel and the Dragon we observe with regret that the author concludes a commentary of wide research and great value by insinuating a doubt of the historical accuracy of the decree of Darius in Dan. vi. 26, 27, upon which Dr. Pusev observes (Lectures on Daniel, p. 446) that 'there seems no reason why Daniel himself should not have been commissioned to write it, as first minister of the empire, or should not have suggested its language.' Dr. Gifford's notes on Baruch and the Epistle of Jeremias are interesting and exhaustive. The first part is considered to be of Hebrew origin, being mostly a cento from early writings, with large extracts from Daniel. The second part, ch. iii. 9-v. 9, bears marks of an Alexandrian Greek The resemblance between Bar. v. and the 11th Psalm of the 'Psalter of Solomon' has been taken as an index of later date; but Dr. Gifford inclines to the view of Dr. Pusey that it was written not so long after the close of the Canon, and before the distresses of the Maccabean period. Canon Rawlinson's historical and topographical illustrations of the Books of Maccabees need no commendations from us, though we might have preferred an assortment of authorities which would have given less prominence to the long extracts from Dean Stanley's Lectures on the Jewish The influence of the history of the Maccabean martyrs upon the Christian Church, and the honour paid to them in the martyrologies, hymns, poems, and liturgies of the East and West, might have claimed a fuller recognition.

The Books of Wisdom and Ecclesiasticus hold a position of their own distinct from the rest of the Apocrypha, especially in their relation to the worship and doctrine of the Christian Church. The Commentary of Cornelius à Lapide devotes more space to Ecclesiasticus than to any of the Canonical Books. Lorinus is even more voluminous. Dionysius Carthusianus is comparatively brief, but condenses a wonderful amount of scriptural illustration. Dr. Edersheim has supplemented the older commentators by adding a quantity of Rabbinical matter. His notes are all valuable and suggestive, though sometimes diffuse and obscure in style. The parallels between Ecclesiasticus and the Epistle of St. James, some fifteen in number, are carefully noted. A Christian influence is traced in some of the interpolations, especially in the Syriac. He observes that the recommendation of

h

ti

fe

W

a

C

W

tr

tie

th

da

'a

tri

Fa

do

ve

log

sid

if s

at

kee

der

tain

sin

of

40-

sati

trai

in t

ben

foreign travel in search of wisdom (Ecclus. xxxiv. 10) indicates an early date, being in direct opposition to the later exclusive views of the Pharisaic sages (vol. ii. p. 4).

Of Dr. Farrar's notes on Wisdom we may say generally that the reader will find them interesting, and the illustrations pleasing and varied; it can scarcely, however, be denied that they are tinged by the author's favourite views and speculations to an extent which hinders him from entering fully into the mind of the writer. There are several minor inaccuracies which a more careful revision would have In the note on page 430 the text on the 'covenant with death' should be Isaiah xxviii. 15, not Psalm xxviii. On page 436 the reference on 'life and incorruption' should be 2 Tim. i. 10, not 1 Tim. ii. 10. In the same note it is wrongly asserted that the word ἀφθαρσία occurs in the LXX. version of the title of Psalm lxxiv. (Heb. lxxv.) It is not found in the Septuagint, but in the version of Symmachus (Origen's Hexapla). There is a curious mistake on page 441: Solomon was 'a king who had 300 wives and 700 concubines.' There is no support that we know of for this reading. One Greek copy in Holmes and Parsons gives '500 wives and princesses.' Philastrius, Heresy 122, mentioned a 'heresy' denying the spiritual meaning of Cant. vi. 8, 'three score queens and four score concubines, and virgins without number.' Attempts were made to reconcile these numbers with

princesses with their attendants' (Glossa Ordinaria). In the notes on Wisdom iv. 10 Enoch is taken as the example of a righteous man prevented by an early death, and it is added that the view that he was exempted from death, the common lot of mankind, was somewhat timidly and tentatively introduced. 'The case of Enoch supplied the Jewish dogmatists with a scriptural proof that length of days was not an exceptionless blessing, and therefore that early death was no proof of guilt or of God's displeasure.' Dr. Farrar passes over the omission of the name of Enoch somewhat slightly, and his reasons for such omission are far from convincing. The author of Wisdom has been speaking of the conspiracy of the ungodly against the just. In this his thoughts would naturally revert to Abel rather than to Enoch. The prolongation of the life of Cain as compared with the premature end of Abel corresponds exactly with the case contemplated 'The righteous live for evermore,' even by the author. though they are 'prevented by death.' The blessedness of the death of the righteous is based upon Isaiah lvii, 1, 2.

those of I Kings xi. I, 2, by explaining the latter as 'seventy

clusive nerally llustraver, be e views enterseveral ld have on the t Psalm ruption' me note s in the .) It is nmachus age 441: cubines. g. One ives and 'heresy' ee score

out num-

bers with

'seventy

Oct.

dicates

n as the eath, and om death, and tenhe Jewish s was not death was rar passes t slightly, onvincing. conspiracy hts would The propremature templated ore,' even

sedness of

lvii. I, 2.

The care of God for His elect, even when the wicked conspire against them, is derived from Psalm xxxvii. author of Wisdom enlarges upon the words in v. 28: 'The Lord loveth judgment, and forsaketh not His saints: they are preserved for ever; but the seed of the wicked shall be cut off.' There is no sufficient reason alleged for assuming that Enoch was taken as an example of early death. The testimony of the son of Sirach (Ecclus. xliv. 16) points to the antiquity of the belief in his exemption from death, as directly asserted in Heb. xi. 5, μετετέθη τοῦ μη ίδεῖν θάνατον. The subject is treated in a more satisfactory manner by Dr. Edersheim, vol. ii. p. 210, who observes that the son of Sirach curtails the LXX. of Gen. v. by omitting the words 'was not found,' and substituting 'was translated' for 'God translated Throughout the greater part of Ecclesiasticus the writer seems 'studiously to ignore another life.' Dr. Edersheim adds that the Rabbis, chiefly in connexion with the Christian controversy, denied the ascension of Elijah into Heaven, a notion which has crept into the margin of the Authorized Version (not the edition of 1611) in 2 Chron. xxi. 12. There would, however, be nothing abrupt or unaccountable in the transition from the premature death of Abel to the translation of Enoch, if the latter event is treated as the remedy for the doubts occasioned by the former.

The teaching of the author of Wisdom is not to be elucidated by such modern phrases as 'a cruel traditional orthodoxy.' 'æonian fire' (p. 437), 'a systematized eschatology,' the final triumph of Universal Mercy' (p. 514). On chapter xii. 10 Dr. Farrar says of 'the malice bred in them,' To talk here of the doctrine of original sin is an anachronism.' But above, on verse 2, he says, 'The writer is not here entering into theological considerations, and it is hardly fair to say that he considers punishment as the cause of repentance and faith.' But if so, why should he introduce the 'theological consideration' at all? In both instances the writer's doctrine is fully in keeping with Old Testament teaching; the objection is derived not from traditional Christian doctrine, but from certain modern developments of it. The use of affliction for calling sin to remembrance and the recognition of God's government of the world is fully expressed in Bar. iii. 30-33, Lev. xxvi. 40-42. The notes on Wisd. xii. are generally obscure and unsatisfactory, and show a want of appreciation of the author's train of thought. There is no more contradiction here than in the books of the Hebrew Canon. Both assert the Divine benevolence and long-suffering, adding that God will by no 152

means spare the guilty. The author of Wisdom is only tracing one of the proofs of the patience of the Almighty in His sending lighter chastisements to precede the heavier judg-There is no apology for an 'arbitrary tyranny' in the Deity (p. 494). There is a basis of a belief in a general philanthropy and love of souls, and a humble recognition of this truth even beneath the apparent inequalities. Dr. Farrar regards Wisd. xii. as the least satisfactory part of the book; his readers may perhaps apply this remark to his notes, which seem to be continually reverting to some rule or standard which is inapplicable to the author, or to the general scope of his observations. His moral is not the duty of exterminating the heathen enemies of Jehovah, but the imitation of God's philanthropy (xii. 19). In the expression, 'a justification of the relentless severity practised by the Hebrews, which occurs in the note on this verse, the Godward attitude of the author in his pious reflections on the Divine omnipotence, patience. and severity seems to be ignored. Dr. Farrar is also unjust to the author of Wisdom in his remarks on chaps. xvi.-xix. The thought that prevails is that of the complete subjection of the creature to the Creator, as in ch. v. 20, 'the world shall fight with him against the ungodly.' Hence the same creatures are for the benefit of His children and for the punishment of His enemies (compare Ecclus. xxxix. 28). The Almighty, instead of making new creations, restrained or increased the powers of nature according to his purpose. Thus many of the plagues of Egypt were natural phenomena, as distinct from miracles or portents. We should plead for the illustration of Wisdom from Philo and Josephus in preference to the importation of Rabbinical fancies and exaggerations. Dr. Farrar's censure of the author of Wisdom for his remarks on the quails is also excessive. Psalm cv. 40 couples it with the gift of manna as a proof of the Divine bounty. In Psalm cxi. 5, it is referred to as the meat (or choicer food) which He gave to them that fear Him. Josephus also confirms this view. The wrath came upon them for their abuse of the Divine gift and their unthankful and rebellious temper. The guilty ones were not as 'beasts fattened for the slaughter.'

As a compensation for these detractions from the merit of the Commentary, we are glad to call attention to some admirable notes on chap. vii. We will conclude with a speci-

men :-

Th

Ve

bee

tat

18

to

re

th

ply des in t end whi des floa to Ver scio hou the in o of t pala whi

in m sky with ture corn shin feel

mid

^{&#}x27;Wisdom in its highest sense is regarded as the personification of the spiritual power of God which pervades the universe, and expresses itself in all things artistically beautiful, mentally pure, and

spiritually noble. The writer nearly approaches the attribution to Wisdom of a distinct personality, a separate essence. Wisdom has to him that ideal reality which he, as a partial Platonist, would have regarded as more real than any physical existence. If the Logos of Philo, though never distinctly hypostatised, constantly reminds us of the Eternal Son, so the Wisdom of this book is often spoken of in terms which might be directly applied to the Holy Spirit '(vol. i. 466).

ART. IX.—THE MAKERS OF VENICE.

The Makers of Venice: Doges, Conquerors, Painters, and Men of Letters. By Mrs. OLIPHANT. (London, 1887.)

THE volume before us is a fresh proof of the sway which Venice holds over the imagination. In spite of all that has been said and written in the past, in spite, too, of the devastating inroads of modern civilization, of the steamboats which ply her canals, and of the havoc wrought by the hand of the destroyer and restorer alike, Venice is still the wondrous city in the sea. The spell which she exercises on the soul still endures and will endure as long as the world itself, the charm which belongs to her is unlike any other. It is not easy to describe in words the sense of marvel and mystery which floats about her, that indefinable attraction which prompts us to read everything about Venice and look at everything Venetian with unfailing interest. Most of all we were conscious of this mysterious charm in that never-to-be-forgotten hour when for the first time we arrived in Venice, and, leaving the heat and dust of the railway station behind us, we glided in our gondola through the water-streets, and heard the splash of the oars and the ripple of the waters on the steps of the palaces which rose on either side of us. And then the days which followed on that first arrival! To live there in the midst of that enchanted wonderland, day after day to drink in more of the sunlight and the beauty, the endless variety of sky and lagoon in all its changeful aspects, to become familiar with intricate calli and winding water-ways, to discover sculptured doorways and trefoil windows in the most unexpected corners, and find blue-robed Madonnas and smiling cherubs shining down upon you in the darkest chapels-was it not to feel the spell grow stronger every day, to realize in a hundred

uniust vi.-xix. ction of ill fight ires are of His instead wers of plagues niracles Visdom ation of censure s is also anna as referred em that

Oct.

racing

n His

judg-

ny' in

eneral

tion of

Farrar book; which andard cope of nating God's

tion of occurs

author

tience,

nes were ne merit ome ada speci-

e wrath

ift and

nification erse, and oure, and different ways the strange glamour which the blending of sea and earth throws over the dullest and most commonplace details of daily life? In other cities of Italy we find the present set in the frame of a great and heroic past; in other places, for all the ugliness of modern inventions, life is still picturesque and attractive; but Venice is a romance, a poem in herself. No wonder that as we linger within her walls the love of all things Venetian sinks deeper and deeper into our breast, until, like her sons of old, we are well content to forget the outer world, and to allow our individual lives to be absorbed and swallowed up in the greatness of her being.

'In the light of summer mornings, in the glow of winter sunsets, Venice stands out upon the blue background, the sea that brims upwards to her very doors, the sky that sweeps in widening circles all around, radiant with an answering tone of light. She is all wonder, enchantment, the brightness and the glory of a dream. Her own children cannot enough paint her, praise her, celebrate her splendours; and to outdo if possible that patriotic enthusiasm has been the effort of many a stranger from afar (p. 2).

At no time have artists and writers been more busy with Venice than they are at present. During the last ten years a whole school of English and American artists have drawn their inspiration from Venice, and formed their style on lessons learnt in her canals. There is scarcely an exhibition which does not contain some Venetian subject, while several of our best painters devote their lives to the reproduction of the ever-changing aspects and the ever-shifting moods of her landscape. Miss Clara Montalba paints the sadder tones and greyer hues under which the lagoons appear at times; she shows us churches and palaces, broad rivers and fishing-boats in the white light of early morning or the growing dusk of eventide. Mr. Roussoff catches in a marvellous manner the rosy flushes and golden glows of sunset on the lagoon, the shimmering light which sparkles from her domes and spires and gleams in her tremulous waves, and weaves all these scattered hues into one magical harmony. Or Mr. Pennell sees some courtyard where cypresses grow tall and black against an ancient well, some terraced roof gay with its pergola of vines and flowers, some palace where the water-gates stand open and the black shadows within contrast sharply with the luminous air and the polished marbles without, and renders all this with a vividness and a brilliancy that would seem beyond the reach of mere pen and pencil.

But it is not only the pictorial capabilities of Venice which form her attraction. The romance of her story is as unique a F O O

k

G

bila of TC neeth pa

fa

of du sci St

tel Th fou Me

bo

wh we g of sea onplace present aces, for curesque herself, we of all ast, until, he outer

Oct.

r sunsets, nat brims circles all ll wonder, Her own lendours; the effort

usy with n years a e drawn n lessons on which ral of our on of the her landnd greyer he shows ats in the eventide. sy flushes immering gleams in hues into courtyard cient well, d flowers, the black air and the h a vivid-

nice which as unique

e reach of

in its way and affords as inexhaustible a subject of interest to the scholar as the beauty of her lagoons offers to the artist who makes Venice his home. 'A wonderful piece of the world!' we exclaim with the greatest of those modern writers who have made Venice the theme of their praise, 'rather itself The archives of Venice are the most interesting, the most minute in detail, of any in the world. And of late years many scholars of European note have been actively engaged in exploring the wide field now open to the student. The fifty-six volumes of Marino Sanudo's diaries have quite recently been given to the world, owing in a great measure to the energy of our fellow-countryman, Mr. Rawdon Brown: and the researches of such distinguished writers as Signor Romanin and Signor Molmenti have disclosed a vast amount of valuable material relating to the public and private history The flood of light thus thrown on the past has of Venice. certainly not deprived the sea-girt city of its charm. A few illusions may have been dispelled here and there. We all know now that Marin Faliero's head never rolled down the Giants' Staircase, and that no prisoner worthy of remembrance ever crossed the Bridge of Sighs. The captives who languished in the pozzi under the ducal palace were no victims of State inquisition, but common criminals of the baser sort. The cells where the princes of Carrara and the great soldier. Carmagnola, were said to have met their cruel doom were never occupied by nobler prisoners than thieves and cutthroats. But the true story of old Venice is full of tragic and pathetic incidents, her stones have tales to tell which move us far more than any melodramas of modern invention. The history of the 'iron hands and patient hearts' who built her walls, 'contending against the adversity of nature and fury of man,' is well worthy to be gleaned and gathered out of the dusty pages in which the chroniclers of bygone days have inscribed their names as worthy to rank among the children of St. Mark.

This is what Mrs. Oliphant has done for us in the pleasant book which she has lately written as a companion to her well-known *Makers of Florence*. The present volume has, she tells us, been far the more difficult book of the two to write. The story of Florence is in great part the story of three or four remarkable individuals. Dante, Giotto, Lorenzo de' Medici, Michael Angelo, Savonarola—these are the shadows which haunt the banks of Arno, the figures whose footprints we find everywhere. But with Venice the case is different:—

18

D

M

ar

of

M

ca

of

B

fo

ar

m

60

de

ha

ch

kr

th

wh

ha

wi

of

'Instead of the men who made her what she is, who ruled her with so high a hand, who filled her archives with the most detailed narratives and gleaned throughout the world every particular of universal history which could enlighten and guide her, we find everywhere the great image-an idealization more wonderful than any in poetry-of Venice herself, the crowned and reigning city, the centre of all their aspirations, the mistress of their affections, for whom these haughty patricians of an older day, with a proud self-abnegation which has no humility or sacrifice in it, effaced themselves, thinking of nothing but her glory. . . . In her records the city is everything—the Republic, the worshipped ideal of a community in which every man for the common glory seems to have been willing to sink his own. Her sons toiled for her, each in his vocation, not without personal glory, far from indifferent to personal gain, yet determined above all that Venice should be great, that she should be beautiful above all the thoughts of other races, that her power and splendour should outdo every rival. The impression grows upon the student, whether he penetrates no further than the doorways of those endless collections of historic documents which make the archives of Venice important to all the world, and in which lie the records of immeasurable toil, the investigations of a succession of the keenest observers. the most subtle politicians and statesmen; or whether he endeavours to trace more closely the growth and development of the Republic, the extension of her rule, the perfection of her economy. In all of these men of the noblest talents, the most intense vigour and energy, have laboured. The records give forth the very hum of a crowd; they glow with life, with ambition, with strength, with every virile and potent quality; but all directed to one aim. Venice is the outcomenot great names of individual men' (pp. 3, 4).

Here, then, in a succession of graphic pictures we follow the gradual rise of the Republic of St. Mark's from the days when Venice was a mere cluster of villages in the marshy lagoon to the hour of her meridian greatness. Doges and conquerors, travellers and painters, historians and scholars pass before us in turn; we follow the course of their splendid achievements in war or peace, and see how they lived and died, and toiled and fought in order that Venice might be great. tive so clearly and easily told is further enriched by numerous illustrations by the hand of Mr. R. R. Holmes, who has shown great taste in the choice of his subjects and considerable skill in their representation. Giovanni Bellini's famous portrait of the grand old Doge, Leonardo Loredano, with the firm thin lips and resolute brow, as he met a league of princes and stood up for Venice against the world, is fitly chosen to face the titlepage. In the same way the bronze horses who paw the air in their matchless strength above the portals of St. Mark's adorn the chapter which records the exploits of the crusading

to To firs gu wh uti Ve lat

in

app alor the of l

157

1888

should

l energy, crowd; irile and tcome—

low the ys when lagoon querors, efore us vements d toiled e narraimerous s shown ble skill rtrait of irm thin nd stood the titlethe air

. Mark's

rusading

Doges, and the Moorish archway on Casa Polo in the Corte della Sabbionera figures in the history of the immortal traveller. Marco Polo. We recognize many of those picturesque nooks and corners which catch the eye as we float along the narrow water-ways or thread the maze of campi and calli in the heart of the city; the sculptured gable bearing the image of the Madonna and called the Bridge of Paradise, the Moorish camel on the house where Tintoretto lived, the lovely gateway of San Gregorio, and the graceful cloisters of the Abbazia. But it is only fair to warn the reader that he will look in vain for more than one of these in the actual Venice of to-day. The group of virgins and saints which once adorned the gateway of the Abbazia, for instance, was removed some years ago, and the tenth-century convent itself, one of the oldest and most interesting in Venice, has been desecrated and stripped of its best sculpture, while many of the ancient well-heads, bocche, or cinte di pozzi which, carved with heads and quaint devices, form so characteristic a feature of Venetian campi, have found their way to the museums of our own land.

Mrs. Oliphant has drawn largely on the stores of native chronicles in which Venice is rich, from Sagornino, generally known as John the Deacon, who in the tenth century recorded the deeds of the Orseoli Doges, down to the most learned and most illustrious of all Venetian historians, Marino Sanudo, whose Vitæ Ducum she quotes freely. At the same time she has profited by the recent researches of nineteenth-century writers, and in disputed points corrects the statements of the chroniclers by frequent references to the more critical works of Romanin and Molmenti. In studying the pages of the old chroniclers she has caught something of their spirit, and learnt to write of their Venice with the same freshness and charm. To many the most interesting part of the book will be the first chapters on the early Doges, those brave rulers who guided the helm of state in the most troublous times, and whose half-forgotten names mark successive epochs of the utmost importance in the history of the young republic. The Venice of those days was very different from the one which later chroniclers describe as the richest and most glorious city in the world:-

'Venice, though already great, was in comparison with its after appearance a mere village, or rather a cluster of villages, straggling along the sides of each muddy, marshy island, keeping the line of the broad and navigable water-way, in dots of buildings and groups of houses and churches, from the olive-covered isle where San Pietro, the first great church of the city, shone white among its trees, along

the curve of the Canaluccio to the Rialto-Rivo Alto, what Mr. Ruskin calls the deep stream, where the church of San Giacomo, another central spot, stood, with its group of dwellings round-no bridge then dreamed of, but a ferry connecting the two sides of the Grand Canal, Already the stir of commerce was in the air, and the big sea-going galleys, with their high bulwarks, lay at the rude wharf to take in outward bound cargoes of salt, salt-fish, wooden furniture, bowls and boxes of home manufacture, as well as the goods brought from northern nations, of which they were the merchants and carriersand come back laden with the riches of the East-with wonderful tissues and carpets and marbles and relics of the saints. and its chapel, the shrine of San Marco, stood where they still stand, but there were no columns on the Piazzetta, and the Great Piazza was a piece of waste land belonging to the nuns at San Zaccaria, which was, as one might say, the parish church. Most probably this vacant space in the days of the first Orseolo was little more than a waste of salt-water grasses, and sharp and acrid plants like those that now flourish in such rough luxuriance on the Lido, or perhaps boasted a tree or two, a patch of cultivated ground. Such was the scenevery different from the Venice of the earliest pictures, still more different from that we know. But already the lagoon was full of boats, and the streets of commotion, and Venice grew like a young plant, like the quick-spreading vegetation of her own warm, wet marshes, day by day' (p. 14).

Such was the aspect of the lagoons when, at the close of the tenth century, Pietro, the first Doge of the Orseolo family, devoted his patrimony to rebuild the palace and church of San Marco, which had been destroyed by fire in a popular tumult, and then renounced the cares and honours of his office to end his days in a convent of the Camaldoli. The second Orseolo, who succeeded his father after a lapse of sixteen years, became still more renowned as the conqueror of Dalmatia, who cleared the Adriatic of pirates, and first made the infant city mistress of the seas. It was on the return of this Doge from his triumphant expedition that the great national festival of La Sensa, Ascension Day, was first instituted.

'The original ceremony was simpler but little less imposing than its later development. The clergy in a barge all covered with cloth of gold and in all possible glory of vestments and sacred ornaments set out from among the olive woods of San Pietro in Castello, and met the Doge in his still more splendid barge at the Lido, where, after litanies and psalms, the bishop rose and prayed aloud in the hearing of all the people, gathered in boat and barge and every skiff that would hold water, in a far-extending crowd along the sandy line of the flat shore. "Grant, O Lord, that this sea may be to us and to all who sail upon it tranquil and quiet. To this end we pray.

me, water mongo to the Spool had day festi

1888

reig him first grat Tor lous ciou and thro diso imp take to (ban reig only plac whe righ in e for 1 of h and Orse

ruled becar had

obse

basil stan ing

Rusother then Canal. going n outs and from iersderful palace stand, Piazza ccaria. ly this than a e that oasted ene-

re dif-

boats,

plant,

arshes,

Oct.

ose of rseolo and e in a urs of The of sixror of made return great insti-

g than a cloth aments to, and where, in the every e sandy e to us e pray.

Hear us, good Lord." Then the boat of the ecclesiastics approached closely the boat of the Doge, and while the singers intoned, Aspergi me, O Signor, the bishop sprinkled the Doge and his court with holy water, pouring what remained into the sea. A very touching ceremonial, more primitive and simple, perhaps more real and likely to go to the hearts of the seafaring population all gathered round, than the more elaborate and triumphant histrionic spectacle of the Sposalizio. It had been on Ascension Day that Orseolo's expedition had set forth, and no day could be more suitable than this victorious day of early summer, when Nature is at her sweetest, for the great festival of the lagoons' (p. 24).

Yet a third Orseolo, Otto, the son of the second Pietro, reigned with honour and advantage to the Republic, proving himself a worthy son of his father, while his brother Orso, first Bishop of Torcello, then Patriarch of Grado, earned the gratitude of future generations by rebuilding the Cathedral of Torcello in its present form. But the Venetians, always jealous of any approach to dynastic succession, became suspicious of the high offices of state held by these two brothers, and, after several attacks upon them both, the Doge was dethroned and driven into exile. An interregnum of anarchy and disorder followed, at the end of which the repentant people implored Orso, the priestly brother, to still the tempest and take up the reins of government, while an embassy was sent to Constantinople to bring back the exiled Doge from his banishment. The Patriarch took his brother's place, and reigned so well and wisely that Sanudo tells us: 'Although only vice-Doge, for the justice of his government he was placed by the Venetians in the catalogue of the Doges.' when the messengers who had been sent to fetch home the rightful Doge returned with the sad news that Otto had died in exile, Orso resigned the trust which he had held so loyally for his brother, and retired to end his days in the discharge of his episcopal duties. Of all his noble race only priests and nuns remained to bear the name, and from that time the Orseoli disappear altogether from history. As Mrs. Oliphant observes :-

'Their story has the completeness of an epic—they lived and ruled and conquered and made Venice great. Under their sway she became the mistress of the sea. And then it was evident that they had completed their mission, and the race came to an end' (p. 36).

But one relic of the forgotten race yet remains—the lonely basilica of Torcello. We can never look at that great church, standing alone as it does in the waste of waters, and its praying Madonna, with the big tear-drops on her cheek, weeping

as it were for the glory that has departed from her shrine, without thinking of the noble Patriarch who reared these ancient walls, and whose race died out here, 'in the silence of the cloister, amid murmurs of solemn psalms and whispering Amens from the winds and from the sea' (p. 37).

In all the annals of Venice there is no more pathetic tale and none more significant of the fortunes of the great Repub-

lic than this of Orso and his house.

The next two chapters of Mrs. Oliphant's book are devoted to the Crusader Doges. Chief among them we have Domenico Michieli, who took the city of Tyre, and brought back among his trophies the twin columns of the Piazzetta and the great stone in the baptistery of San Marco, on which tradition says our Lord sat down to rest outside the gates of Tyre, and the still more famous Enrico Dandolo, the blind old Doge who led the fourth Crusade, and was the first to plant the banner of St. Mark on the ramparts of Constantinople. heroic old man himself never came back to Venice, for he died at Constantinople in 1205, three years after he had sailed for the East, and was buried with royal honours in St. Sophia; but the four bronze horses which he rescued from the sack of Constantinople and sent home to adorn the façade of the great basilica, remain the noblest memorial of his conquests.

Without attempting to give any consecutive history of the Doges, Mrs. Oliphant contrives to show us the different steps by which the Republic extended her sway and attained her splendour, while at the same time she gives a clear and lucid account of the successive changes in the constitution which destroyed all possibilities of political freedom, and led to the confirmation of the oligarchical form of government. the head of Doge Pietro Gradenigo, we have a description of the two rebellions which led to the closing of the Great Council and the institution of the famous Council of Ten. This formidable tribunal henceforth held the supreme place in the State. It had power of life and death over every citizen of Venice, and from its decisions there was no appeal. The Doges themselves, as the tragic fate of Marino Faliero and the deposition of Francesco Foscari proved, were subject to its jurisdiction. The impenetrable mystery in which the proceedings of the court were wrapped, the vow of secrecy exacted from each member and all who appeared before them, the system of secret denunciations and of secret deliberations by which the most exalted officers of state might be accused and condemned before they knew the crimes of which they were

heltril of cou have the otic Car to l

188

sim but mo cor tha whe son of t mon tion hist who lead sold fare stor had para of t his a of h But, there was eigh Cour reac bard said the (when met court and o

asked

hrine. these ice of ering

c tale epub-

k are ought zzetta which ates of nd old nt the The e died ed for ophia; ack of of the con-

of the t steps ed her d lucid which to the Under tion of Great of Ten. e place ry citiappeal. Faliero subject ich the secrecy e them, ions by sed and

ey were

held guilty, all served to heighten the awe which this dread tribunal inspired, and to make the name of the Ten a name of terror. Recent historians of Venice have taken this famous council under their protection, and Romanin's investigations have dispelled some of the romance which had gathered round these terrible trials. But it is impossible for the most patriotic Venetian to justify such actions as the murder of the Carrara princes, or the treachery which brought Carmagnola

to his end.

Mrs. Oliphant repeats several of these dark stories in the simple words of the chroniclers who have recorded them, but is careful to supplement her narrative with all that modern apologists can find to add by way of explanation or correction. Few incidents in that record are more touching than the story of the poor old Doge, Francesco Foscari, who, when his son Jacopo was sent into exile by the Ten, bade his son farewell in the simple words, 'Jacopo, go, obey the will of the country,' and who, when he was himself deposed a few months later, died of grief the day after his successor's elec-But for dramatic completeness nothing in Venetian history equals the tragedy of Carmagnola. The great captain who, from the son of a Piedmontese peasant, rose to be the leader of the Republic's armies, is so remarkable a type of the soldier of fortune as he appears at that period in Italian warfare, his career was so brilliant and his fate so cruel, that his story deserves to be told at length. His services to the State had been undoubted, his triumphs over her foes almost unparalleled, and the worst that can be said to justify the action of the Signoria was that his usual success had not crowned his arms in his latest campaign. If he was a traitor, no proof of his treachery has been discovered by the most jealous eyes. But, as Mrs. Oliphant justly observes, he was too great and therefore dangerous, and for once he had failed. So his doom was sealed; and so inviolably was the secret kept that, during eight months which elapsed between the decision of the Council and the execution of their sentence, not a word reached their victim, who, at the head of his army in Lombardy, thought himself as great and as safe as ever. It is said that when first suspicions were entertained against him, the Council sat all night long at their deliberations, and that when morning came the Doge leaving the council-chamber met Carmagnola, who was in Venice at the time, crossing the court on his way to pay his respects to him. With serene and cheerful face—con fronte molto allegra—the valiant captain asked the Doge gaily whether he should wish him good

morning or good evening, seeing he had not slept all night. The Doge replied with a smile, 'There has been much talk of you in the Council.' Little dreaming the sinister meaning hidden under these courteous words, Carmagnola went on his way, and returned to the camp without a thought of the grim fate that already overshadowed him. And when the summons reached him to come to Venice to give the Signoria his advice as to the state of affairs, he turned his steps homeward unsuspecting as ever, welcomed by the people who loved him, and escorted by a troop of distinguished gentlemen who met him at Mestre. Straight to the palace he went into the presence of the Ten, to be by them cast into prison, tortured, and thirty days later led out to die between the columns of the 'Piazzetta,' gagged so that he might not speak, 'lest the sound of the great soldier's well-known voice should rouse the people to fury at their hero's fate.' As it was, the historian says, they vented their grief and horror in low cries of Sventura! sventura! Mrs. Oliphant may well say :-

'The situation is one which requires no aid of dramatic art. Here in a moment, betrayed out of the air and light, and the freedom which he had used so proudly, this man, who had never feared the face of men, must have realised his fate. At the head of a great army one day, a friendless prisoner the next, well aware that the light of day would never clear up the proceedings against him, or common justice, such as awaits a poor picker and stealer, stand between him and the judges whose sentence was a foregone conclusion' (p. 234).

From this dark blot on Venetian annals we turn with relief to a brighter page—the story of Marco Polo. No more romantic tale of travel was ever told than this of him whom the Venetian youth, not without a touch of irony, called Marco of the Millions, because of the fabulous wealth of the kings and countries in those Oriental regions of which he spoke. The whole thing reads more like a story out of the Arabian Nights than a sober statement of facts; but, making due allowance for certain legendary episodes which are introduced in the course of his narrative, there seems no reason to distrust Marco's own descriptions of the strange places and people he had seen on his journey through Asia. At least, this Venetian merchant was the first mediæval traveller to describe the natural features and the manners and customs of the different kingdoms of the Asiatic continent, the first to tell of the Mongolian steppes and the islands of the Indian Archipelago, of the wealth of India, and the temples and

pa

18

Ma mi the Cri the Ta bei We he

Pop his travethe Pop min their the

fifte twen by t forg hous twen figure

only

weard moth these the cri in co these many But a a pla

frien magr feast went coats palaces of Burmah, and of the vast extent and advanced civilization of the empires of China and Japan.

Everyone has heard of Marco Polo, but it is perhaps not so generally known that his father and uncle, Niccolò and Matteo, were travellers before he was born. It was in the middle of the thirteenth century that these two merchants of the Casa Polo, a family settled in the parish of San Giovanni Crisostomo, first started to explore Central Asia, and found their way to the court of the Great Khan, the lord of all the Tartars in the world. This 'courteous and gentle human being' was so much interested by the travellers' account of Western lands, and struck by the truth of their religion, that he sent them back to Europe with an earnest request that the Pope would send a hundred Christian missionaries to teach his subjects the true faith. The journey home took the travellers three years, and on reaching Rome they found that the old Pope was dead, and after long delays all the new Pope, Gregory X., could do for them was to send two Dominican brothers to accompany them when they set out on their second journey to the court of the Great Khan. Even the courage of these apostles failed them when they reached the port of Lagos, and the two brave merchants, accompanied only by Niccolò's son, young Marco, at that time a boy of fifteen, were left to go on their way alone. It was almost twenty years before the travellers were heard of again, and by that time the other members of Casa Polo seem to have forgotten their very existence.

'When there suddenly appeared at the gate of the great family house full of cousins and kinsmen, one evening in the year 1295, about twenty-four years after their departure, three wild and travel-worn figures, in coats of coarse homespun like those worn by the Tartars, the sheepskin collars mingling with the long locks and beards of the wearers, their complexions dark with exposure, their half-forgotten mother-tongué a little uncertain on their lips—who could believe that these were Venetian gentlemen, members of an important family in the city which had forgotten them? . . . Seeing them so transfigured in countenance and disordered in dress, men could not believe that these were those of the Ca' Polo who had been believed dead for so many and many years' (p. 141-4).

But at length, continues the chronicler, the travellers formed a plan by which they succeeded in convincing their incredulous friends of their identity. They invited all their relatives to a magnificent banquet in Casa Polo, and at the close of the feast Messer Marco, the youngest, rising from the table, went into his chamber and brought out the three sheepskin coats in which they had arrived from the East.

M 2

ight.
talk
ning
n his
grim
suma his
ward
him,
met
precured,
umns

peak,

voice As it

orror

may

Oct.

ic art.
e freefeared
a great
nat the
nim, or
and belusion'

n with more whom Marco kings spoke. rabian ng due oduced son to es and t least, eller to toms of first to Indian les and

'And immediately the three began with sharp knives to cut open the seams and tear off the lining, upon which there poured forth a great quantity of precious stones, rubies, sapphires, carbuncles, diamonds, and emeralds, which had been sewed into each coat with great care, so that nobody could have suspected that anything was there. For on parting with the Great Khan they had changed all the wealth he bestowed upon them into precious stones, knowing certainly that if they had done otherwise they could never by so long and difficult a road have brought their property home in safety. The exhibition of such an extraordinary and infinite treasure of jewels and precious stones which covered the table filled all present with such astonishment that they were dumb and almost beside themselves with surprise, and they at once recognized these honoured and venerated gentlemen of the Ca' Polo, whom at first they had doubted, and received them with the greatest honour and reverence. when the story was spread abroad in Venice, the entire city, both nobles and people, rushed to the house to embrace them, and to make every demonstration of lovingkindness and respect that could be imagined. And Messer Matteo, who was the eldest, was created one of the most honoured magistrates of the city, and all the youth of Venice resorted to the house to visit Marco, who was most humane and gracious, and to put questions to him about Cathay and the Great Khan, to which he made answer with so much benignity and courtesy that they all remained his debtors. And because in the continued repetition of his story of the grandeur of the Great Khan he stated the revenues of that prince to be from ten to fifteen millions in gold, and counted all the other wealth of the country always in millions, the surname was given him of Marco Millione, which may be seen noted in the public books of the Republic' (p. 145).

Such is the curious scene recorded by the Venetian chroniclers of the fifteenth century. Marco Polo's own narrative was taken down from his lips by a Pisan writer, Rusticiano, in the dungeons of Genoa, after the two had been taken prisoners in the naval defeat of Curzola, where Marco served as a volunteer. At the end of a year this captive, whose marvellous tales of far Cathay had charmed the ears of his fellow-prisoners, was released. In 1290 Marco returned to Venice, married, and spent the remainder of his life in uneventful obscurity. The following note, appended to two of the oldest copies of his manuscript preserved in the libraries of Paris and Berne, is valuable as showing the great respect in which Messer Marco was held in his old days, and the high value already attached at that period to the record of his travels:—

'This is the book of which my Lord Thiebault, Knight and Lord of Cepoy (whom may God assoil!), requested a copy from Sire Marco Polo, citizen and resident in the City of Venice. And the said Sire

188

Ma

rep

sho

life mos serv with cap tion sold as h emb

and to s tinu sixt soug alth loss the But, Ven and splei whic pitch and from

feast

MILY

Oct.

open

rth a

dia-

with

was

d all

wing

long

The

with

hem-

dand

bted,

And

both

nd to

eated

youth

mane

d the

n the

Khan

fifteen

Marco Polo, being a very honourable person of high character and report in many countries, because of his desire that what he had seen should be heard throughout the world, and also for the honour and reverence he bore to the most excellent and puissant prince, my Lord Charles, son of the King of France and Count of Valois. gave and presented to the aforesaid Lord of Cepoy the first copy of his book that was made after he had written it. And very pleasing it was to him that his book should be carried to the noble country of France by so worthy a gentleman. And from the copy which the said Messire Thiebault carried into France, Messire John, who was his eldest son and is the present Sire de Cepoy, had a copy made after his father's death, and the first copy that was made after it was brought to France he presented to his very dear and dread Lord, Monseigneur de Valois, and afterwards to his friends who wished to have it. . . . This happened in the year of the Incarnation of our Lord Jesus Christ, one thousand three hundred and seven, and in the month of August' (p. 152).

After the story of Marco Polo, Mrs. Oliphant gives us the life of Carlo Zeno, the brave seaman who saved Venice at the most desperate moment of the war with Genoa, and whose services his ungrateful city rewarded at the close of his career with prison and disgrace. And, next to 'the great and noble captain, Carmagnola,' whose tragic story, as already mentioned, is given at length, we have an account of another soldier of fortune, Bartolommeo Colleoni, whom we all know as he rides in bronze on the square of San Zanipolo, a living embodiment of all that was fierce and martial in that age of ceaseless warfare.

The conquests which Carmagnola first made for Venice, and the fatal ambition which led the mistress of the seas to seek for empire on the mainland, involved her in continual wars throughout the fifteenth century. Early in the sixteenth, her neighbours, jealous of the supremacy which she sought, combined against her, and the League of Cambray, although it failed to destroy the Republic, inflicted heavy losses upon her, while at the same time her dominion in the East was seriously impaired by the advance of the Turk. But, in spite of these public reverses, the private history of Venice at this time reveals an unexampled degree of wealth and prosperity. This was the very moment of her greatest splendour, the moment when the sumptuousness of living for which Venice had always been famed had reached its highest pitch, when St. Mark's was the centre of the most brilliant and richly coloured life the world has ever known. Strangers from the far North, kings and princesses who were royally feasted and amused at the expense of the Republic, went

chrorative ciano, taken served whose of his ned to in untwo of praries

d Lord Marco aid Sire

espect ad the

ord of

home with their eyes dazzled by all the splendours they saw, as they sat in their gondolas draped with crimson satin, or listened to the strains of fairy music and watched the torchlight processions along the Grand Canal. They wondered at these majestic churches rising from the water's edge, these palaces of marble and porphyry, at the lavish display of sculpture and frescoes with which they were decorated, at the costly furniture and treasures they saw within, and exclaimed with Philippe de Commines, 'Surely this is the most triumphant

and the best-governed city of the whole earth.'

Then Venice was the haven where scholars from the East and West alike sought shelter, and where men of letters, we are told, rejoiced to find greater freedom of speech than in any other city. Her intercourse with Constantinople had long attracted the student who hungered after Greek manuscripts, and sought to discover the pure text of classical authors, now she boasted her academies and Platonists, and could point proudly to the printing-press of Aldus and the library of Sanudo. And then too a quickened sense of joy in all things beautiful revived the love of art and gave Venice a school of painters which compares worthily with the most illustrious in

any land or age.

The development of painting was somewhat late in the lagoons, and it was not till the latter half of the fifteenth century that the flower of art burst into its full glory in the persons of the two Bellini. The destruction of their splendid series of paintings in the Hall of the Great Council by fire in the next century has deprived us of many of their masterpieces, and in the same way the frescoes with which Giorgione and Titian adorned the palaces of the Canal Grande have vanished under the baneful influences of time and sea-air; but the churches of Venice, the Ducal Palace, and, above all, the admirable collection of the Accademia delle Belle Arti-a collection which is, we regret to say, daily enriched with the spoils of stripped altars—give us ample opportunities of studying Venetian art in Venice. There we can still see the Madonnas of Giovanni Bellini-those Virgins holier and tenderer than all others in their majestic motherhood, and his sweet childlike cherubs piping their flutes on the steps of the thrones; there we can gaze on Carpaccio's St. George riding full tilt at the dragon in the glorious might of his Godgiven manhood, and watch by the bedside where Ursula sleeps her maiden slumber and dreams, with head sunk on her pillows, of the angel visitant who brings her the palm of martyrdom in his hand. And if too many of Titian's masterpiece art b Giov prese Para Duca A

1888

a sec gene whos of Ve pathi the n of th speed Bellin the li word she re she a portra age. his ea Virgi blue-1 tian s as a our p immo is a s name. he is

0 taking graph and s gives where peak o

"T The wa of the Venice the wo Oct.

saw,

n, or

orch-

ed at

hese

y of

t the

imed

hant

East

s, we

an in

long

ripts,

now

point

ry of

hings

ool of

ous in

n the

eenth

endid

by fire

aster-

rgione

have

r; but

ill, the

-a col-

th the

study-

ee the

d ten-

nd his

of the riding

God-

pieces are gone to other lands, and of Giorgione's exquisite art but one first-rate example—the lovely landscape of Palazzo Giovanelli—remains to-day in Venice, Tintoretto is nobly represented in his wonderful series at San Rocco, in his great 'Paradise,' and his incomparable 'Bacchus and Ariadne' of the Ducal Palace.

Mrs. Oliphant devotes one chapter to the early masters, a second to Giorgione and Titian, the painters of the second generation, and a third to Tintoretto and Paul Veronese, whose sumptuous decorative art belongs to the declining days of Venice, and reflects the decadence of the Republic. Her sympathies, it is easy to see, are altogether with the early masters, the men whom Mr. Ruskin has taught us to love for the sake of their pure and tender feeling, their simple directness of speech and sincerity of devotion. Of Carpaccio, of Gian Bellini and his scarcely less illustrious brother, she speaks with the liveliest appreciation; but warmly as we agree with every word she writes of these delightful painters, it seems to us she renders but scant justice to Titian's greatness. It is true she acknowledges the indisputable magnificence of those portraits with which he has helped to make the history of his age. But she does not appear to appreciate the charm of his early Madonnas, and dismisses the 'Presentation of the Virgin'—that picture we remember so fondly with the little blue-robed maid mounting the temple steps among the Venetian senators, and the crag of Marmarolo in the distanceas a decorative tableau with an odious old woman. our part we can never think of this man and his long roll of immortal works without recalling Mr. Ruskin's words: 'There is a strange undercurrent of everlasting murmur about his name, which means the deep consent of all great men that he is greater than they.'1

On the other hand, Mrs. Oliphant has a skilful way of taking us into the midst of Venetian scenes, and by a few graphic touches helping us to realize the life which her artists and scholars led. Very pleasant is the picture which she gives of that house at Biri Grande, on the edge of the lagoon, where Titian came to end his days within sight of the lofty peak of Antelao and the blue hills of his home in Cadore.

'There is no trace to be found now of that home of delights. The water has receded, the banks have crept outward, and the houses of the poor now cover the garden where the finest company in Venice once looked out upon one of the most marvellous scenes in the world. The traveller may skirt the bank and linger along the

Ursula ink on alm of naster-

The Two Paths, Lecture 2.

lagoon many a day without seeing the sea-fog lift and the glorious line of the Dolomite Alps come out against the sky. But when that revelation occurs to him he will understand the splendour of the scene, and why it was that the painter chose that house looking out across the garden and its bosquets upon the marvellous line of mountains coming sheer down, as it appears, to the water's edge. soaring clear upward in wild yet harmonious variety of sharp needles and rugged peaks, here white with snow, there rising in the sombre grandeur of the living rock, glistening afar with reflections, the lines of torrents and every tint that atmosphere and distance give. . . . Here the painter gathered his friends about him and supped gaily in the lovely evenings, while the sun from behind them shot his low rays along the lagoon and caught a few campaniles here and there gleaming white in the dim line of scarcely visible country at the foot of the hills. If the sun were still too high when the visitors arrived, there was plenty to see in the house, looking over the pictures with which it was crowded, the wonderful glowing heads of dukes and emperors, great Charles in all his splendour, or, more splendid still, the nymphs and goddesses without any aid of ornament which were destined for all the galleries in Europe. A famous grammarian from Rome, Priscian by name, in the month of August 1540, describes such a party, the convives being Aretino-"a new miracle of nature "-Sansovino the architect of San Marco, Nardi the Florentine historian, and himself. "The house," he says, "is situated in the extreme part of Venice on the sea, and from it one sees the pretty little island of Murano and other beautiful places. This part of the sea, as soon as the sun went down, swarmed with gondolas adorned with beautiful women, and resounding with the varied harmony and music of voices and instruments which till midnight accompanied our delightful supper, which was no less beautiful and well-arranged than copious and well-provided. Besides the most delicate viands and precious wines, there were all those pleasures and amusements that were suited to the season, the guests, and the feast." . . . No doubt the Venetian promenaders, taking their evening row along the edge of the lagoon, kept as close to the shore as courtesy permitted, heard the murmur of the talk with admiration, and pointed out where Messer Titian the great painter feasted and entertained his noble guests in the shade' (p. 298-300).

The fourth and last division of Mrs. Oliphant's book treats of Venetian men of letters. Of Venetian poets there are none. Strange to say, this most poetic of cities, which has stirred so many souls in other lands to song, and has fired the muse of Shelley, of Byron, of Samuel Rogers, of Alfred de Musset and of Théophile Gautier in turn, has had no poets of her own. And so, for lack of native singers, Mrs. Oliphant here describes the visit paid to Venice in 1362 by Petrarch, when, driven from one place to another by fear of the plague, and by the horror of those frequent wars which at that time

distinct by ful for out win the stor noc with his a sh

con

con

poe

188

just sessi but : the s refu else tranc more upor harm prud exult ever accu the e right of ju

of S beau arou nesse balce the the I sligh pron orious in that of the grout one of edge, eddles ombre lines is low there e foot rived, s with s and

Oct.

which narian o, dencle of entine in the pretty of the lorned ny and

d still,

ranged viands ements . No ong the mitted, where noble

panied

treats re are ch has s fired Alfred poets iphant trarch, blague, t time distracted the rest of Italy, the wandering poet sought refuge in this city, which, 'by the far-sightedness of her citizens and by the advantage of her natural position, appears more powerful and tranquil than any part of the world.' There he lived for four years, in a palace lent him by the Signoria, looking out on the Riva, enjoying the prospect over the port from his windows and moralizing over the prosperity of the city and the extent of her commerce. Here Boccaccio, the famous story-teller, paid him a visit and joined the poet in delightful nocturnal rambles on the sea, and in enlightened conversation with the wits and scholars of the place. Here, as he sat at his window looking over the wide sea one summer day, he saw a ship crowned with green boughs, and bearing the flag of the conquered foe at its helm, sail into port with the news of the conquest of Candia. Catching the enthusiasm of the hour, the poet writes to his friend in these ecstatic terms:—

'What finer, what more magnificent spectacle could be than the just joy which fills a city, not for damage done to the enemy's possessions or for the gains of civic rivalry such as are prized elsewhere, but solely for the triumph of justice? Venice exults, the august city, the sole shelter, in our days, of liberty, of justice, and peace, the sole refuge of the good, the only port in which, beaten down everywhere else by tyranny and war, the ships of those men who seek to lead a tranquil life may find safety and restoration: a city rich in gold, but more rich in fame, potent in strength, but more in virtue, founded upon solid marble, but upon yet more solid foundations of concord and harmony-and, even more than by the sea which girds her, by the prudent wisdom of her sons defended and made secure. Venice exults, not only over the regained sovereignty of Crete, which, howsoever great in antique splendour, is but a small matter to great spirits accustomed to esteem lightly all that is not virtue; but she exults in the event with good reason, and takes pleasure in the thought that the right is victorious, that is to say, not her proper cause alone, but that of justice '(p. 335).

The poet proceeds to describe the splendid thanksgiving services with which this conquest was celebrated in the basilica of St. Mark's, 'than which I know nothing in the world more beautiful,' the magnificent procession of people and clergy around the Piazza, and the grand tournament which he witnessed, seated at the Doge's right hand on a richly draped balcony erected for the occasion in front of San Marco, behind the bronze horses. Unfortunately Petrarch's sentiments for the Republic soon underwent a marked change. A fancied slight which he received from some young Venetians who pronounced him 'dabben uomo, ma ignorante'—'a good man but ignorant'—offended his dignity so deeply that he refused

to remain in a city 'inhabited by so great and varied a crowd,' and where men without knowledge are believed to be philosophers. So he left his palace on the Riva, and from that day Venice saw him no more. He retired to Arqua on the slopes of the Euganean hills, whose dim blue outline we see to-day from the waters of the lagoon, and in this peaceful

retreat a few years afterwards he died.

But if Venice has no poets of her own to boast, she may point with pride to the long line of illustrious chroniclers who, from the days when the young Republic first rose from the waves, devoted their pen to celebrate her glory. Truly, as Mrs. Oliphant observes, 'their name is Legion,' and it would be impossible to enumerate the number of busy workers who, writing in turn of the laws and trade of Venice, her wars and political revolutions, her ways and customs, have at one time or other helped to swell the chorus and magnify what every Venetian held the supreme object of his desire—the fame and greatness of Venice. Chief among them we may name Petrarch's friend, the learned Doge Andrea Dandolo, who in his history first attempted a compilation of the older chronicles and fragments; Marco Antonio Sabellico, whose Latin work remains the fullest and most attractive to the general reader; and Marino Sanudo, who, besides his Vitæ Ducum and other published works, left behind him that wonderful record—in fifty-six volumes—of all the events that happened in the lagoons and all the news that reached Venice between the years 1482 and 1533. It is difficult to overrate the importance of this work or to explain the immense interest of these minute details which reproduce with such careful exactness what was happening day by day in Venice four hundred years ago. The festas, the embassies, the orations, the debates in the council, the news from the battlefield, the reports that arrived from all quarters of the globe, are faithfully recorded here, brightened with a hundred little personal details and touches which add to its human interest. The following incident, for instance, is delightfully characteristic both of Sanudo himself and of the age. It was Ascensiontide in the sad year 1509, just after the rout of Agnadello. The armies of the Republic were in full retreat, the fathers of the college were broken down with trouble, and the Doge, brave old Loredano, looked like a dead man. Never had so mournful a festival been held in Venice as that La Sensa. No visitors were heard of, no one was to be seen on the Piazza. All around there was nothing but weeping. this Sanudo describes with a groan over his country's ruin, and a sigh that his own advice had not been followed. And

pre my goo fave (p. Ma adv barg gen man

refo

and

1888

to g and post ever the thre diar disc been

his volu amo of t year Raw the know the

of h

have reno from Ven Ron della and work

in th

philoat day on the we see

Oct.

e may s who. om the uly, as ould be s who, rs and e time everv ne and name who in onicles n work eader: d other ord-in in the een the ortance minute nat was o. The council, rom all rhtened ich add ance, is the age. he rout

retreat,

ole, and

Never

that La

seen on g. All y's ruin,

. And

presently he adds the following little note: 'On the way to my house I met a man having a beautiful Hebrew Bible in good paper, value twenty ducats, who sold it to me as a favour for one marzello, which I took to place in my library' (p. 362). Even the disasters of his country could not destroy Marino's pride in his collection, or prevent him from taking advantage of these troublous times to drive so excellent a bargain as this. With all his merits as a chronicler and his genuinely patriotic spirit, Sanudo was not a successful public man. A thorough Conservative by nature, he opposed every reform, every innovation, with the most inflexible obstinacy, and in the Senate was almost always—he owns it himself— 'contradicting,' so that we need not wonder to hear that he had many enemies, and that at one period of his life he was excluded from public office. But nothing would induce him to give up the work he had begun, and which he repeats again and again will, he is confident, prove of the greatest value to posterity, the highest honour to his country, and to himself an everlasting memorial. And the present generation has seen the proud words fulfilled. For, after being lost sight of during three hundred years, these fifty-six volumes which the great diarist bequeathed to Venice in their oak press, were in 1805 discovered in the Royal library at Vienna, and have recently been published for the first time. 'All at once, after three centuries and more, old Venice sprang to light under the hand of her old chronicler, and Marino Sanudo with all his pictures, his knick-knacks, his brown rolls of manuscript and dusty volumes round him, regained, as was his right, the first place among Venetian historians—one of the most notable figures of the mediæval world' (p. 372). And within the last few years, by the loving care of his editor and biographer, Mr. Rawdon Brown, a tablet has been placed on Sanudo's house in the parish of San Giacomo dell' Orio, so that all the world may know the place where the great historian lived and died in the Venice which he loved so well.

Last in this long procession of great old Venetians, we have the famous printer Aldus Manutius, the founder of the renowned Stamperia which was the meeting-place of scholars from all parts of the world and the centre of literary life in Venice during the early part of the sixteenth century. A Roman by birth and an intimate friend of the brilliant Pico della Mirandola, Messer Aldo settled in Venice about 1490, and soon afterwards began to publish the first of those classical works which issued in rapid succession from his printing-press in the Campo di San Agostino. A true lover of learning and

a scholar of the most refined taste, Aldo was inspired by the noble wish to give the world correct editions of the best classical authors, printed from the most trustworthy manuscripts and revised by the first scholars of the day. For this end he spared no labour and no expense, gathering poor scholars under his roof to aid him in the arduous task of revision, and often undertaking long and toilsome journeys in search of some manuscript which might throw light on the subject in hand. On one occasion when he was journeying through Lombardy in search of manuscripts of Virgil, it was his ill-fortune, owing to some mistake, to be taken prisoner and detained a week by the guards of Francesco Gonzaga, Marquis of Mantua, and in his letters to that prince he complains that it is rather hard he should receive this unjust treatment on Mantuan territory when he is illustrating the works of Virgil who was a Mantuan. His fate was the harder because Gonzaga's wife, the illustrious lady Isabella d'Este, was one of Aldo's most esteemed friends and patrons, and was in constant correspondence with the printer, whose choice editions she prized so highly. But from the first Aldo's enterprise attracted the attention of all lovers of learning, not only in Italy but in other parts of the civilised world, and Erasmus of Rotterdam spent some time in his house, giving him the benefit of his advice in collating and revising manuscripts for editions of the comedies of Terence and Plautus and the tragedies of Seneca, although Scaliger in his philippic against the Dutchman declares that while he was under Aldo's roof he ate for three and drank for many without doing the work of one. So fashionable a resort in the early years of the century had the printing-press in the quiet Venetian Campo become, that in one of his dedicatory epistles Aldo complains humorously of the constant interruptions to which he is exposed. Not only do letters from scholars in all parts of the world reach him in such numbers that it would take him night and day to answer them all, but his doors are beset with a crowd of idlers, attracted by mere curiosity to see what is going on within-

'Some from friendship, some from interest, the greater part because they have nothing to do; for then, "Let us go," they say, "to Aldo's." They come in crowds and sit gaping—

"Non missura cutem, nisi plena cruoris hirudo."

I do not speak of those who come to read to me either poems or prose, generally rough and unpolished, for publication, for I defend myself from these by giving no answer, or else a very brief one, which

I he or s esta bold over anyticom will man

Ital

188

pres star the the ting as ' in] agei long rare that shou who lette anxi toge biog mos the surp

for n work ment volut the g a new he revisio publ

been

sixty

Cam

susp

by the

e best

manu-

or this

poor

of re-

eys in

on the

neying

it was

nzaga, e com-

unjust

ng the harder

d'Este, ns, and

choice

enter-

ot only

rasmus

im the

ipts for

nd the against

roof he of one.

iry had

ne, that

orously

1. Not

d reach l day to

rowd of

oing on

I hope nobody will take in ill part, since it is done, not from pride or scorn, but because all my leisure is taken up in printing books of established fame. As for those who come for no reason, we make bold to admonish them in classical words in a sort of edict placed over our door—" Whoever you are, Aldo requests you, if you want anything, ask it in few words and depart, unless, like Hercules, you come to lend the aid of your shoulders to the weary Atlas. Here will always be found in that case something for you to do, however many you may be" (p. 378).

Not only Greek and Latin classics, but the masterpieces of Italian literature, issued in course of time from the Aldine press, all printed in the finest type on the choicest paper, and stamped with the anchor and dolphin that were the mark of the Stamperia. The first of these to appear in volgare was the poems of Petrarch, edited with the utmost care by the distinguished Cardinal Bembo, and described on the title-page as 'taken from the very handwriting of the poet.' This was in July 1501, and on August 3 Isabella d'Este's confidential agent in Venice, Lorenzo da Pavia, was able to send her the long-desired volume printed on paper of the finest quality, 'a rare thing,' and worthy of the peerless lady herself, adding that it is the wish both of Messer Aldo and of Bembo that she should be the first to receive a copy of the precious book whose advent had been so eagerly expected. In the same letter hopes are given her that the Dante which she was anxiously expecting will shortly appear in the same form, together with the works of Virgil and Ovid.

'Everything is good in these books,' says Aldo's French biographer Renouard. 'Not only for their literary merit, most of them being the greatest of human works, but also in the point of view of typographical excellence, they are unsurpassed. . . .' Unfortunately the war of the League of Cambray and the reverses of the Republic compelled Aldo to suspend his labours, and in 1510 the printing-press was closed for more than two years. At the end of that time he set to work with renewed vigour, and the letters of Cicero, the commentaries of Cæsar, and the works of Plato were among the volumes published in the course of 1513 and 1514. But already the great printer's health was failing fast. In the preface to a new edition of Lucretius which appeared in January 1515, he regrets that he can no longer superintend the work of revision himself, and his death soon afterwards stopped the publication of Boccaccio's 'Decameron,' upon which he had been engaged for some time back. He died at the age of sixty-seven, leaving his children poor, having freely spent

because Aldo's."

poems or I defend ne, which both fortune and health in the service of mankind. But of all the glorious memories of Venice none is more worthy of honour than that of this ideal printer whose life was devoted to the production of the best works in the best possible way, who laboured with such ardent enthusiasm in the cause of literature and died poor.

We are grateful to Mrs. Oliphant for numbering Aldo among the great names of Venice. Certainly her account of him and his work is not the least instructive and delightful chapter in a book which is instructive and delightful from the

first page to the last.

ART. X.-MEMORIALS OF ARCHBISHOP TRENCH.

Richard Chenevix Trench, Archbishop: Letters and Memorials. Edited by the author of Charles Lowder. (London, 1888.)

THERE are not many names in the roll of the Anglican episcopate which carry such gracious memories as that of Archbishop Trench. No doubt there have been scholars as great or greater. But his scholarship was conversant in fields that are attractive to us all: the literature that we love best, the words which are in our common use, the Bible in its nearest relations to our minds and souls. His poetry was true and sweet, and filled with its spirit everything that he wrote, whether in prose or verse; while everyone who knew him, either in his books or in his life, felt that, deep as was his

culture, his piety was deeper.

The editor of these Memorials has brought to the task a literary skill well trained in previous works which the Church has greatly prized, and the volumes on which so much loving care has been expended cannot fail to possess a charm. But we agree with the words of the preface, which say that a complete biography would in some respects not have been so difficult as what has here been essayed. The wishes of the Archbishop himself, as well as the lack of sufficient materials, were thought to forbid the attempt to write a life, and in default of a biography it was decided to publish the letters to or from him which remained after large losses in both departments, and to add so much of a connecting narrative as might

this a published but inst have there differ of n gard yet proposition.

188

be a

part wish the com scale betw mate

I

are mos

we happly prett futur maturalitera collectorage very board cially and was body and

the In of in mothe

lived

But of hy of voted way, ase of

Oct.

Aldo unt of ghtful m the

norials. 888.)

nglican that of olars as in fields we best, nearest rue and wrote, ew him, was his

e task a Church holoving m. But a combeen so es of the naterials, ad in deterters to a departas might

be absolutely necessary to introduce the letters. In executing this design the editor has had the satisfaction of reflecting that a project which the Archbishop himself had entertained of publishing a volume of old letters was thus being carried out. But surely, if he had himself executed his idea, the letters, instead of being strung upon the thread of his own life, would have been connected by recollections of the friends who wrote them, and the character of the work would have been very different from the present. Here there is a continuous thread of narrative of a biographical nature, which we cannot but regard as intended to furnish us in some sort with a life. And vet it is of necessity a very imperfect life. It brings into disproportionate prominence the parts of the history connected with the letters which chance to have been preserved, and we are obliged to doubt whether what we read about is really the most important part of the life story, and whether even the part of the story which we have is fully told. We heartily wish, therefore, that the editor had not been restrained from the design which she is so capable of executing—the prepa ration of a life of the Archbishop aiming at proportion and completeness. It need not have been planned upon the large scale to which recent biographies have accustomed us, but between letters and personal recollections we are sure that materials for a delightful memoir could have been found.

But we must not be discontented. The objections which we have ventured to express to the plan of the work scarcely apply to the first volume, in which the succession of letters is pretty continuous. Many of them, especially those of the future Archbishop himself, are of great interest. The early maturity of his powers is most remarkable. His exquisite literary taste seems to have perfected itself almost from his college days, and while still in his teens he had composed a tragedy which won high approval from Macready and had very nearly gained the distinction of representation on the boards. But it is of the second volume that we desire especially to speak. It covers the period of his Irish episcopate, and we shall view it from the standpoint of Irish Churchmen, a body not so large but that their suffrages can be easily gathered, and whose general opinions we can give with some confidence. They are perhaps worth listening to, since he lived his life under their eyes for twenty-one years.

Neither the Irish strain in the Archbishop's origin nor yet the Irish interests which operated in his mind are made much of in these volumes. Yet he was certainly an Irishman. His mother ought to know, and she writes to his father how she pleaded to Berthier 'that you were Irish:'1 while her son himself says that a Spanish cura 'seemed pleased to hear I was Irish.' It is true that his ancestors immigrated to Ireland two hundred and fifty years ago. But it is pretty well known that the air of the country has had the gift of turning settlers into Irishmen in a much shorter period than that. The Trenches have been a notable element in Irish society, proverbially successful in holding their own, and returning, we are bound to say, the value of their acquisitions with interest in good examples and charities to this very day. Who are Irish if not the Trenches? The Archbishop was as much of an Irishman by origin as John Mitchell or as Mr. Parnell, and probably much more so than the larger part of the Revisionists whom he encountered in the Synod. Of course his life had been chiefly lived in England. and he had formed English habits and ties, as his letters more than once declare. But he nearly sacrificed his life for Ireland when he brought back the fever from the country in the famine time. And when he was identified with her as a bishop he ever showed the fullest acceptance of the national bond. He was not one of those bishops, of whom there have been too many in Ireland, who conceived themselves to represent English interests. And we feel certain that if any should understand from this work that he was an exotic in his own diocese they would be taking a view extremely displeasing to him.

No one could gather from the Memorials that the Irish Church returned his zeal for her welfare by the most affectionate reverence and regard. But such was the fact. His appointment was received in Ireland with universal contentment, not only for his own sake, but because the name of Arthur Penrhyn Stanley had been widely mentioned for the post, to the great apprehension of the majority of Irish clergy. It is curious and somewhat appalling to speculate by the way upon the consequences which might have followed if Stanley had been appointed. It is within our knowledge that he said that in all the questions of Revision in which the clergy and laity differed the laity seemed to him right. It would not be just to infer from this obiter dictum what his course would have been if he had practically had to deal with the Revision question. A closer view of the Revisionist laity might have convinced him that their object was rather to narrow the Church than to broaden it, and the well-known chivalry of his character might have hindered him from being the instrument of a very uninstructed majority in oppressing the weaker party. But under no circumstances could Stanley have

1 Remains of Mrs. Richard Trench, p. 178.

secuto A so r which which the ther men which Syn

1888

meethis trium the A The course wrom his wand Irela

wrot

that many of wh him thad speak heard Mem Irelan

Lord

still; by this Empiremiscon conquelove of tireme accordand sin

And to tion s Almig

mself Irish.' ndred air of nen in been ful in y, the es and ches? s John than in the gland, s more reland amine nop he l. He en too t Engunderliocese nim. e Irish affec-His ontentame of for the clergy. he way Stanley he said rgy and not be ld have Revision ht have row the ry of his trument

weaker

ey have

secured the amount of deep-seated confidence which was given to Archbishop Trench. It is a defect in this memorial that so much more should be said of the torments and annovances which he met among his people than of the signs of affection which they gave him, and which we are well persuaded filled the larger place in his own thoughts of them. One testimony there is which obviously came within the plan of the work to mention, yet is wholly omitted. We mean the reception which the announcement of his resignation met with from the Synod of his diocese. It had two stages—the first when he wrote to excuse himself from taking the chair at the stated annual meeting of the Synod, and the second when a special meeting was called to hear his letter of resignation and elect They were scenes not to be forgotten, a his successor. triumphant close to a troubled episcopate; and the friends of the Archbishop might remember the proceedings with pride. The late Provost of Trinity College said that 'he had in the course of their connexion often differed, whether rightly or wrongly, from his Grace, but no one could doubt that through his whole career his Grace had been actuated by one single and strong motive-zeal for the welfare of the Church of Ireland, and a desire to preserve it as far as in him lay." Lord-Justice Fitzgibbon said that 'throughout the entire of that difficult journey the Archbishop had no doubt met with many things with which he could not agree, and some things of which he could scarcely approve, but he had ever kept before him the one object—the good of the Church over which he had been called to preside.' The Dean of St. Patrick's, speaking as representative of the clergy, asked, 'Who ever heard him say a discouraging word?' and Mr. Gibson, Member for the University and now Lord Chancellor of Ireland, said :-

'We represent the whole Church of Ireland; we represent more still; I believe we represent all Ireland. It is given to him to know by this meeting, and by the tribute conveyed to him throughout the Empire, that he has not lived in vain. He has outlived, lived down, misconception. He is understood and honoured by all. He has conquered, without qualification or exception, the veneration and love of all; and now in the evening of his life, in the enforced retirement, postponed as long as bodily health would permit, with one accord we all of us, from the bottom of our hearts, sadly, solemnly, and sincerely bid him Godspeed and farewell.'

And the formal reply of the Synod to the letter of resignation states 'that the Synod recognizes with thankfulness to Almighty God the conscientious wisdom, the pious diligence, VOL. XXVII.—NO. LIII.

the great learning, and munificent liberality wherewith the Archbishop ruled his diocese during a difficult and trying period of twenty-one years, and which leave it in its present flourishing and peaceful condition.' Of all this not a word in the Memorials! The letter of resignation is given, but, so far as the reader of this work is made aware, it might have been received without response or acknowledgment by those to whom it was addressed. Surely these voices of the Church over which he had ruled were more worthy of insertion than the letter of Lord Spencer, the only record of external opinion upon the Archbishop's resignation of his duties which is mentioned in the book. And again, while the family memorial erected in Westminster Abbey is duly recorded, and its inscription given, not one word is said of the beautiful monument which his clergy placed in Christ Church, Dublin, to his memory, nor of the larger memorial, in the shape of endowments at Alexandra College, which is still in progress. Hardly appropriate omissions, these, in the life of one so courteous

and grateful.

The unanimity of respect and affection entertained for him in Ireland is the more remarkable because it is an instance of the victory of genuine worth over many defects in the qualities of popularity, in securing the general goodwill. greatest admirer of Archbishop Trench will confess, though not so heartily and readily as the Archbishop would have declared it himself, that there were many helps to popular favour in which he was deficient. He was a scholar who enjoyed the company of his books better than that of any living human beings except a limited circle. And it was possible to see that this was the case. An eminent man said that the Archbishop always seemed to him to be making a couplet while they were talking. Although there was not in him the slightest tinge of hauteur, either literary or episcopal, yet those who would know him had to advance to him. They must not expect him to advance to them. In public speaking his articulation was not distinct, and his manner and tone were very sad. He carried a soldier's heart under his cassock, but not a soldier's gaiety. During his literal soldiering in the Torrijos expedition he can hardly, to judge by his letters, have done much to keep up his comrades' spirits, though he was ready to face death beside them; and it was so with his sermons and confirmation addresses. The Irish are not singular in liking the solemnity of their public speakers to be relieved with an admixture of pleasure and of hope. And we do not think that if their Archbishop lost some ground thro emi alto in s

1888

that Mar bish from in th extr out o We proc not i ber v and I been to th syno coulc of hi secur

upon

to the

all, it

be re of fac view. is a vision those editor is, fro misle that 1 fende was tl wise. that h suppo And whose 1888

trying present word in t, so far ve been hose to Church on than external es which nily me-, and its 1 monun, to his endow-Hardly ourteous

Oct.

ith the

ined for instance s in the The ill. , though have dear favour oyed the g human le to see he Archolet while him the opal, yet They m. speaking and tone is cassock, ring in the is letters, though he s so with sh are not kers to be ope. And ne ground through his defects as a popular orator in a time which so eminently required popular oratory, the blame should be laid altogether upon them. They found him out and loved him, in spite of himself

in spite of himself. And this brings us to the matter of Revision. We fear that these Memorials are over-weighted with the subject. Many who have bought the work for the sake of the Archbishop will feel themselves in for something very different from what they had counted on when they find that they are in the midst of a battle of kites and crows in which there is extremely little of him to be discerned, and that little quite out of the way of his characteristic pursuits and preferences. We doubt also whether the place which the question, and the proceedings connected with it, filled even in his own life are not involuntarily exaggerated. Hasty readers will not remember what a long period of years they are being hurried over, and how small a portion of the Archbishop's time can have been filled by these Revision letters and the events which led to them. Certainly we have been used to believe that between synod and synod there were long periods during which he could shut the door of his study, or take his place in the midst of his family, and leave the Revisionists and all their works securely outside. Some of the books which show him busied upon subjects as far as possible from those of Revision, belong to the years of the agitation: for instance, the lectures upon Gustavus Adolphus and upon Plutarch.

However, if the story of Revision was to be alluded to at all, it should have been related correctly. And it could only be related correctly by those who took part in it. As a matter of fact, it is told in this book wholly from an English point of view, and with most imperfect information. And the result is a representation of the Archbishop's connexion with Revision which is extremely different from the remembrances of those who were concerned in it. It is not merely that (as the editor has pointed out in a letter to the Guardian) the story is, from the plan of the work, imperfect; it is absolutely misleading. To read the Memorials, one would suppose that the Archbishop stood alone, a sturdy, unyielding defender of the Prayer Book as it was, against all comers, and was the leader of the opponents of Revision. Very far otherwise. He took no such position. It was well known, indeed, that his feeling was strongly against Revision, and his moral support was given to those who were engaged in resisting it. And a most valuable help this was. For here was a man whose piety and learning were recognized upon all sides, whom

N 2

the party that were for rending the Prayer Book in the name of gospel truth could not claim. But from the first the Archbishop took up that position which is familiar to English churchmen as the approved episcopal attitude: he had his preferences, yet felt it his duty to be the bishop not of one party but of all, and to recognize his obligations to every side. He consented to take his place in an assembly in which the laity should in number double the clergy, he consented to allow the laity a vote in questions of doctrine, he consented to sit with the rest of the bishops upon the Revision Committee. For these concessions many blame him: it has become quite a familiar opinion among those who look on the history entirely from the outside, that the bishops had the ball at their feet, and could have made what terms they pleased. We feel entirely incompetent to pronounce any such decision. bishops may have been timid—we remember Archbishop Trench himself laughing with us over a description of bishops in the Times, 'like elephants, large and timid creatures.' But the cry of 'thorough' has before now upset the coach, and the policy of the Irish bishops at least kept their Church together when there seemed no small danger of a disruption.

Anyhow, Archbishop Trench took his place in the General Synod, in which bishops, clergy, and laity sit and debate together; the bishops upon a dais, the rest upon the plain beneath them, the laity doubling the clergy in numbers, but voting separately whenever such a vote is demanded by six of either order. The bishops vote by themselves whenever any of their number demands their judgment on a question. All matters connected with the Church, whether doctrinal or practical, are liable to discussion and decision in this mixed assembly. But no change can be made in the formularies or law of the Church except by majorities of two-thirds of the two inferior orders voting separately; with a power in the bishops to negative the decision of the other orders if eight out of eleven bishops disapprove. And these majorities are required, first in favour of a resolution on which to found a bill for the proposed change, and secondly, a year afterwards, in favour of the bill itself. In consenting to recognize this constitution Archbishop Trench was forced to go counter, not only to the opinion of many English churchmen who could not approve such a departure from the primitive composition of Church assemblies, but to that of the two men in his own diocese who stood highest in his esteem-Archdeacon Lee and Dr. Maturin. Having deliberately taken such a step, it is needless to say that he loyally recognized the authority

wh me fore work Ger app pro we that imp

of t

188

matt perselette this betra scrup sit in longer have

whole there assen indig which the or descri ness t suffere agains the tu judgm

such

all sob man r should Longf

regard

Oct.

e name e Arch-English had his t of one ery side. hich the ented to onsented on Combecome e history at their We feel on. The chbishop f bishops res.' But ach, and r Church sruption. e General d debate the plain bers, but by six of never any All tion. ctrinal or his mixed ularies or rds of the wer in the rs if eight orities are ound a bill erwards, in e this coner, not only could not position of in his own

eacon Lee

a step, it

e authority

which he thus accepted. He was no Talleyrand to make mental reserves in subscribing to a constitution, and we therefore do not quite see why his biographer always places the words General Synod between inverted commas, though it is General Synod in all his own writings, without any sarcastic appendages. We pronounce no opinion whatever upon the propriety of Archbishop Trench's decision in this matter; but we may mention, in restraint of a disposition to censure him, that the two sturdy churchmen above named, who found it impossible to follow him themselves, yet continued on terms of the closest friendship and communion both with him and with clergy who imitated his example, and that they made no protest beyond the refusal to sit and the use of their right under the Act of Parliament to retain the unaltered Prayer Book.

Archbishop Trench's conduct in the Synod is a different matter from his consent to recognize its authority. His personal demeanour there was perfect. Dr. Maturin, in the letter which concludes the Memorials, speaks only truth in this respect when he says that the Archbishop 'never was betrayed into saying a word or doing an act which the most scrupulous would recall.' But Dr. Maturin did not himself sit in the Synod, and there is some exaggeration in the 'prolonged martyrdom' which he supposed the Archbishop to have endured there. The power of his reputation and character, his simple dignity and unconsciousness of self had so general an effect upon an assembly certainly not callous to such influences, that there was perhaps but one man in the whole body who ever treated him with real disrespect. And there were an amply sufficient number of friends in the assembly to repel any attacks from that quarter with fitting indignation. Of attacks from outside, the most violent which had to be borne by the opponents of Revision was the outbreak about Mr. Portal's Manual, which will be found described in the Memorials. But it would be ascribing weakness to the Archbishop to suppose that he could have greatly suffered under a ridiculous outcry which was not even directly against him. The letter which he wrote without foreseeing the tumult was yet obviously necessary and right in the judgment of every sensible person. He cannot have much regarded an effervescence which was felt even at the time by all sober people to be a perfect absurdity. When a gentleman moved in the Synod that the petition upon this affair should be preserved among the Church's records, old Judge Longfield, who was acting as assessor, said, 'If Mr. ——

wishes the petition to be kept, he has nothing to do but to

keep it.'

Although the Archbishop had not personally anything very formidable to endure, it was a moral martyrdom to him to sit by while the most difficult questions in theology were handled by what Canon Liddon aptly calls a 'singular collection of clergymen, colonels, and lawyers.' And yet there might be men, not inferior to the Archbishop in knowledge and in reverence, for whom the interest and excitement of these curious scenes would have overborne the sense of their incongruities. To Bishop Wilberforce, for instance, we believe it would have been a constant delight to exercise in so admirable a field his powers as a master of debate. assembly had every quality which a born guide of men could desire. It was both intelligent and responsive, well-meaning and good-hearted, and sorely in want of light and leading. After what we have said the reader will not suspect us of forgetting how much reason the Church of Ireland has to thank God for Archbishop Trench and for his work, even in the very matter of Revision. But he was not a master of debate. He was something greater perhaps and better, but not this. He never led, either in the general campaign against Revision or in any episode of it. To speak of 'the fight led by the Archbishop' is quite a mistake. To begin with, he had no inclination for casting his thoughts upon religious matters into a dogmatic shape. There is scarcely, we believe, among all his published sermons or charges one which can properly be called doctrinal. Doctrinal statement was not the form in which his mind took hold. Perhaps Dean Church expresses the reason of this when he says that 'what others deal with only as divines he also saw as a poet.' At all events so it was. And it is no wonder that he shrank from the work of discussing doctrinal formulæ in the heat and passion of a popular assembly, when he displayed no taste for such work in the quiet of his study. Even where doctrine was not in question there were influences which checked the Archbishop from interfering. The speaking was so vehement and ready, and things passed so quickly, that a man used to make his decisions in quiet converse with books was not likely to be at home. It was hard to decide how much had to be sacrificed, and how much it was worth sacrificing, to avoid a disruption. But the most important point of all was that the Archbishop had deliberately taken his position, not as a fighter for his own hand, but as one of the bench of bishops. Nor was he the leader of the bench. That place belonged to the Primate

wl kn an bis rev otl

> bu ma

18

the thir cle not not Th cle selv sup the

is c

stil

sion bish to o that bot. Men by war subst

very Men using of re chan matt at al

how

bish

o but to

Oct.

nything to him gy were r collecet there owledge ment of sense of ance, we ercise in The te. en could meaning leading. ect us of d has to , even in naster of etter, but n against ht led by h, he had s matters among all operly be form in expresses deal with ents so it e work of sion of a such work as not in rchbishop and ready, make his kely to be sacrificed, disruption. rchbishop ter for his

Nor was he e Primate who, with very little indeed of the Archbishop's theological knowledge, possessed far more alertness, presence of mind, and enjoyment of a fray. But it was impossible that any bishop should be the leader of a general opposition to all revision, both because the questions were all decided by the other orders and because the bishops were all themselves members of the Revision Committee.

members of the Revision Committee. It was not by any bishop that the fight was really fought, but by a small band of clergy, acting without any leader and making unfailing use of the vote by orders, without regarding the indignation which was expressed when they baulked by this means the desires of nearly all the laity as well as of a clear majority of their own order. However, even they had nothing formidable to bear in the Synod. The majority was not ill-humoured, and no private resentments were engendered. The only persons who had to make real sacrifices were country clergy who had to go back to parishes where all but themselves were Revisionists, and where they were destitute of that support and sympathy in the course they were taking which their city brethren had in abundance. At all events, this is how the resistance to Revision was conducted, and to this cause it is due that where so much was lost there was not more loss The Archbishop seldom spoke, and only on two occasions throughout all those years called for a vote of the bishops upon any question; he could not, indeed, have hoped to defeat measures by this means, but it is perhaps surprising that he did not oftener wish to record his own protest. In both these cases he was unsuccessful, though in one, as the Memorials relate, his protest may have had considerable effect by procuring the reversal of the decision to leave out the warning clauses in the recitation of the Athanasian Creed and substituting what to many seemed no less injurious to faith, the silencing of the Creed altogether. It must be remembered, however, that the course which he threatened to take if the arrangement first made had been persisted in, was not of the very serious and almost awful character which readers of the Memorials would perhaps imagine. It was merely that of using the privilege which the Disestablishment Act gave him of retaining his place in the Church without accepting the changed Prayer Book-a course which many clergy took, as a matter of course, without anybody in their congregations being at all the wiser.

It can be no harm to say that the bishops, or even Archbishop Trench alone, could have prevented some of the objec-

T

B

qı

fr

th

A

T

wl

re

Pu

of

bis

ca

or

lar

the

wa

vit

Th

ing

Iri

cha

wa

no

the

WO

to

bisl

beli

had

said

cert

tionable things that were done; for, in reference to the canons, he said so himself.

'There has been, in my judgment, too much of the "tight which will tear" in some of our recent legislation; and, for myself, I regret that I did not oftener and more distinctly express my sense of this while matters were still in debate; even though I might not have judged that the matter was of such extreme gravity as to call for further resistance.'

Whether he might not have done more in the way of resistance to more important changes than those which the canons are concerned with, we cannot tell. But certainly he might have tried, and, we suppose, would have tried, if he had thought that these changes vitally affected the faith. We find for instance, in the Memorials, a large treatment of the Preface to the new Irish Prayer Book. We know that the Archbishop objected to it. But if he had objected to it as strongly as Dr. Pusey he could not possibly have omitted the means of resistance which he possessed. We ourselves detest the Preface, and, on the whole, agree with nearly all that Dr. Pusey says of it. But the Preface was not the work of the Revision party. It was a sop manufactured (most unnecessarily in our judgment) by the middle party, who had only helped Revision under compulsion, for the consolation of their more extreme friends under the disappointment of nearly all their demands. The committee which prepared the Preface was proposed by Dr. Salmon, and he, as the Memorials state, moved its successive clauses. But the Preface, in its original form, was drawn up by the Bishop of Killaloe, a man of the utmost ability, and of what one might call extravagant moderation; and when a speaker in the Synod lamented that so able a man should be known to posterity by so miserable a composition, the Bishop replied that he would be content if posterity remembered him as one who had striven for peace. It is impossible to suppose that a document brought forward by such men for such a purpose would have been pressed if an authority like Archbishop Trench had declared it dangerous to the faith, and such as his conscience would not permit him to accept. He divided the bishops against it at last when its enactment was a foregone conclusion, but never made any such declaration as to its tendency while it was in debate, and accepted it when it was passed.

It is one of the unavoidable disadvantages of the plan of this book that one finds it difficult not to give a biographical

XUM .

¹ Charge of 1871, p. 51.

which

regret of this ot have call for

of rech the nly he ne had Ve find e Pre-Archrongly means est the at Dr. of the necesd only of their arly all Preface s state, original of the modethat so rable a ntent if r peace. forward

t was in plan of raphical

essed if

it dan-

uld not

st it at

ut never

value to the documents it contains, in spite of the writer's assurance that we are not reading a biography. And so the letters of Dr. Pusey to Archbishop Trench will be read as if they gave Archbishop Trench's mind. They certainly do give his mind so far as to indicate that he was in communication with Dr. Pusey, and had the same sense of that great man's learning, goodness, and representative character, which is entertained far beyond the limits of the great movement which he led. But how far he was from accepting Dr. Pusey's views of the questions about which they corresponded will appear from a simple statement. There are in the Memorials five letters from Dr. Pusey. In the first (ii. 123) Dr. Pusey concedes that he does not see what harm it could do to gather representatives of the laity in a separate chamber, but says that in granting this the bishops have granted the utmost—but the Archbishop consented to sit in one chamber with the laity. The second refers merely to a design of resignation of his see which the Archbishop never really entertained. The third refers to two proposed rubrics on the Holy Eucharist. Dr. Pusey declares that if either of them were carried, he, were he an Irish clergyman, would betake himself to England—now, of one of these rubrics notice had been given by the Archbishop himself. The fourth refers to the statements of the Preface, and declares that if they were passed the writer cannot imagine any person who has belief in the Sacraments or in Absolution remaining, much less being ordained, in Ireland, and that to divide against them only and then to accept them is to sin against truth with eyes open—now, the Preface was passed with certain alterations, of which none were at all vital, and the Archbishop divided against it, but accepted it. The fifth is a general review of the Revision proposals, including the Preface, and declares again that if the writer were an Irish clergyman he would, if the bishops acceded to those changes, resign his office and come to England; but there was still one way left; it could still be said, 'We will have no changes by majorities,' else the Irish would have put out their candlestick with their own hands, and the Archbishop would have been only called to his office in the Irish Church to connive at, and so to assist in, its destruction—the Archbishop accepted all the changes which the majorities made.

Dr. Pusey, when the Revision was over, is reported, we believe on good authority, to have said that the Irish Church had escaped heresy, though by the skin of its teeth. If he said so, the declaration must perhaps be taken to imply a certain softening of the censures expressed in these letters,

such as is quite natural and common in the passage from argument against matters still in debate to judgment upon matters completed. But, whether this be so or not, it is certain that the letters must be read as giving the opinions of Dr. Pusey, not of Archbishop Trench. How Archbishop Trench thought of the matter may still be read in his Charges. Revision had proceeded very far indeed, and even the Preface had been proposed, and every one of Dr. Pusey's five letters had been received, when he said:—

'There are some—I number myself among these—bound by every tie of duty and honour to this Irish Church, whom nothing but an extreme act of unfaithfulness to the truth which it has in keeping, such an act as it is difficult to conceive, should ever separate from it and from yielding to it, so long as life and strength are theirs, the very best service which they can render.'

When Revision was all over he said:-

'For myself, I may say now as I have said always, namely, that to my mind the undertaking of Revision at the time when we did undertake it was a serious mistake and full of danger. I did not recognize the opportuneness of the time. With my convictions, indeed, no time would have been opportune for such an experiment. But those convictions must not lead me to deny that the discussions which ensued, if they offered much to be regretted, had also an educating power on us all which it would be unworthy not to acknowledge. Men know the best and worst of one another's teaching—the amount which there is of divergence—and have found that it is less than they once supposed—that it does not constitute a chasm so wide that they can scarcely make their voices intelligible to one another across it—but rather one which, however it may still exist, is not incapable of further diminution.' ²

And in his last Charge he says:-

'I will not shrink from repeating what more than one Englishman high in Church or in State, more than one who must have meditated long and anxiously on subjects near akin to those which for these years have agitated and sometimes divided us, has expressed to me or in my hearing. They have not refrained from the utterance, not of their gratification only, but of their honest surprise at the difficulties which this Church of ours has looked in the face and by God's grace has surmounted, the precipices to the right hand or to the left over which it has not fallen, the quicksands which have not engulfed it, while yet all these were lying so perilously near. . . . To my mind, at least, all the differences which at present exist among us are tolerable, such as may be very well borne among brethren.' 3

F

I

a

it

n

R

a

ha

aı

bo

st

¹ Charge of 1875, p. 19.
² Charge of 1879, p. 28.
³ Charge of 1881, pp. 20-21.

We, for our part, could well have wished that Archbishop Trench had left behind him in a charge, a book, or even a series of letters, which the present work might have given to the light, a solemn estimate of the Irish Revision, measured and just like all his literary work, but condemnatory, as we know it must have been. Such a judgment from such a man would have been an invaluable instrument for Irish Churchmen against the time when it becomes possible to attempt the reversal of the work of Revision and the simple adoption of the same Prayer Book with the Church of England. That time may come when a generation or so from the completion of the Revision shall have passed. And when the proposal is made nobody will be able to mention any good that the Revision has ever done, or any friendships which it has conciliated, which can compensate for the reproach which it has brought, and the disadvantage at which it has placed the Church in her attempts to retain her ordination candidates in spite of the attractions of England. The Irish bishops must have felt rather guilty when the late Lambeth Conference declared 'that no particular portion of the Church should undertake Revision without seriously considering the possible effect of such action on other branches of the Church,' for the Irish Church carried on its Revision without seriously considering anything of the kind.

But anyone acquainted with Ireland, or even with the general conditions of religious movement anywhere, will know that a long time must elapse before such a revision of Revision could be attempted. Opinion is slow to change in Ireland on account of the small proportion of reading people; and though Church principles have made no slight progress, it is impossible that twelve years or twice twelve could have converted the body of less than a third of the clergy and a mere handful of laity, which was defeated upon the existing Revision, into the two-thirds majority both of clergy and laity which would be needed for its reversal. An attempt to reopen Revision would not now in Ireland obtain five responsible

adherents-among Churchmen.

If such a state of parties is ever to grow into one which will make possible the peaceful setting aside of what has been done, obviously the necessary thing is to strengthen and encourage the growth of Church feeling within the bounds of the Irish Church itself. In no other way could a new Revision, not to mention objects even more important still, be brought about. And plainly the way to assist the growth of a Church party is not to make so much of the evils

d by othing as in ever

from

ipon

it is

shop

rges.

eface

r, that we did id not ctions, iment. ssions lso an know-g—the is less ssm so one exist, is

shman ditated r these I to me ice, not difficulty God's the left ingulfed To my iong us

XUM

of the Revision as to render it doubtful whether every Churchman is not bound to flee the country. The best thing that can be done for Irish Churchmanship is to prove by precept and practice that Church life is still possible in the land. And from this point of view the opinions of Archbishop Trench, as we have quoted them, and still more his example, are of

immeasurable value.

The judgments, indeed, of such a man as Dr. Pusey cannot fail, though given from outside, to meet respectful attention from a certain number even in Ireland. But we should be suppressing what we know to be the fact if we did not say that unfortunate misunderstandings, as well as sheer distance and want of acquaintance, deprive Dr. Pusey's name even for Churchmen in Ireland of a good deal of the power which it possesses for all such persons in England. And we do not believe that his letters here published will enlist any enemies to the Preface who were not its enemies before. But Archbishop Trench belonged to Irish Church-people himself. He was their own. He had lived among them, suffered with them, studied and debated with them, and given of his means to them with a noble generosity, in the confidence that they would prove themselves not a Protestant sect but a Church. His judgments will have permanent weight with them. But we fear that those who are for minimizing, perhaps in too great a degree, the results of Irish Revision, will feel that they have Archbishop Trench on their side as against his biographer, who, having first absorbed the whole band of Irish opponents of Revision into the Archbishop, absorbs the Archbishop into Dr. Pusey.

We should be truly sorry to seem unconscious of the merit and interest of the work before us. We have written in a spirit of the deepest reverence for Archbishop Trench, but also of justice towards the Irish Church, which, if it be little thought of, and in many ways deservedly so, ought for that reason to receive the most scrupulous fair play. It is not fair play to represent it as so poor in catholicity that the defence of primitive principles in it depended on one man, and that practically an Englishman. It is not fair play that a biography of Archbishop Trench should leave an impression of the position of Irish Churchmen so far less favourable than that which was held by the Archbishop himself, and weight them beyond what is just in their efforts to maintain their testimony and fight their battle, which is not an easy one. And it is not fair play to let it be understood that they were

iı

C

W

q'

tl

O

th

p

li

th

W

re

ha

th

180

insensible to the merits of one whom they loved and honoured very deeply.

We earnestly hope that in a new edition, doubtless soon to be called for, the work may present a fuller record of the loyal affection which he felt for his children in God, and of the success which in times of great difficulty attended his labour of love among them.

ART. XI.—REPORT OF EDUCATION COMMISSION.

- Final Report of the Commissioners appointed to inquire into the Elementary Education Acts, England and Wales. (London, 1888.)
- Summary of the Final Report containing the Conclusions and Recommendations of the Commissioners. (London, National Society's Depository, 1888.)

In one respect this Report—or rather Reports—is disappointing. It might have been hoped that, after seventeen years' experience of the irritation and ill-feeling created by the rival systems of elementary education, there would have been sufficient good feeling and genuine love for religious liberty to have allowed men of the most opposite views to have united upon proposals which would have been fair to both sides, and which would have enabled parties hitherto discordant to have acquiesced in what was just to their opponents as well as to themselves. For this purpose it was necessary that the friends of religious education, on the one hand, should recognise that there is an influential party which is bent on securing, if possible, a secular, and, if not that, an undenominational religious system; and, on the other, that the friends of such a system should be equally prepared to allow the just claims of those who advocate definite religious teaching. The State insists that every child in the country shall be instructed in what is required for this world's business, but whether it be religiously or irreligiously, whether in the belief or unbelief of Christian doctrine, it professes to be indifferent. On the other hand, those to whom is entrusted the task of communicating this instruction attach the highest value to that point about which the State insists upon its neutrality, if not indifference.

Oct.

rch-

that

cept

And

nch.

e of

nnot tion l be say ance n for hich

not mies

rch-

He

with

eans

they

urch. But

too

they

pher,

nents

into

merit

in a

, but

little

r that

t fair

fence

l that

bio-

ion of

than

veight

their

one.

were

1888

The friends of religious education look upon instruction in secular learning without adding to it teaching in the truths of Christianity as a boon of more than doubtful benefit, and as more likely to raise up sceptics and evil livers than moral and high-principled citizens; whilst, on the other hand, those who differ from them contend that it is no part of the duty of the State to secure religious instruction for children attending public elementary schools, and it would be profitless if attempted; for religious instruction in a day school, given by teachers who may or may not make a profession of religion, can do little or nothing towards the formation of religious character, whilst by attendance at a Sunday school, where the teachers are unpaid, but actuated by religious motives, much more will be effected, though the teaching itself may be technically very inferior. At the same time, it seems to outsiders that these advocates of secular or undenominational religious teaching are so afraid of strengthening the political influence of the Church that they are prepared to run any risk rather than promote in the smallest degree what is the special object of their aversion, for they appear instinctively to feel that in the long run the Church will gain most by religious education being given in elementary schools. But diametrically opposed as are these systems, it might be possible for each party to afford to its opponents that liberty which it claims for itself; and it ought to have been anticipated that the party which inscribes upon its banner 'religious liberty for all' as one of its distinguishing characteristics, would be ready to welcome proposals which would secure for all that benefit which it professes to advocate. Unfortunately, and not for the first time, experience shows that profession and practice are very different things: whilst the friends of religious education are ready to accord to their opponents all, and even more than all, that they can fairly ask, the so-called friends of religious liberty will consent to little or nothing which does not tend to the injury and eventual destruction of the teaching which they dislike. An examination of the two reports now before us will abundantly illustrate what we have just said.

The Education Commission consisted of twenty-three members, who had been carefully selected for their knowledge or intimate connection with some branch of the subject, and necessarily included men of the most discordant views. In their final conclusions the Commission was divided into two, or, perhaps we should say, three parties. The majority who signed the Report consisted of fifteen, whose names it may be well to mention: Viscount Cross (chairman), Cardinal Manning,

on in hs of id as noral hose ty of ding f atn by gion, gious e the much techiders gious ience ather biect in the being ed as afford and it cribes listinoosals ses to expeferent dv to l, that iberty o the ore us

Oct.

t-three vledge et, and s. In wo, or, signed be well nning, the Duke of Norfolk, the Earls of Harrowby and Beauchamp, Lord Norton, Sir Francis Sandford, Archdeacon Smith, Rev. Dr. Rigg, Canon Gregory, Rev. Dr. Morse, Mr. C. H. Alderson. Mr. J. G. Talbot, M.P., and Mr. Samuel Rathbone. Of these Cardinal Manning qualifies his signature by regrets that the Commission has not proposed to place voluntary schools more nearly on an equal footing with board schools; Lord Norton his by objecting to payment by results in any form; Sir Francis Sandford his, on several points; Mr. Alderson his, on matters relating to the examinations; and Archdeacon Smith his, on any assistance being given to voluntary schools out of the rates. Our readers will see at once that the names constituting the majority represent widely different religious interests, and very differing relations to the question of elementary education. The Roman Catholics are represented by Cardinal Manning and the Duke of Norfolk; the Wesleyan Methodists by the Rev. Dr. Rigg, the principal of the Wesleyan Training College, Westminster, and a late member of the London School Board; really Liberal politicians by Mr. S. Rathbone, chairman of the Liverpool School Board; official representatives of the Education Department by Sir Francis Sandford, for many years its permanent secretary, and by Mr. C. H. Alderson, for many years one of H.M.'s inspectors of schools; to whom should be added Lord Norton and the Earl of Harrowby, who at different periods filled the responsible office of Vice-President of the Committee of Council, and so were the heads of the Education Department, Lord Harrowby having also been a member of the London School Board. The other seven were in different ways connected with the work of education, two of them, Canon Gregory and Dr. Morse, having been members of the London School Board, and the former being treasurer of the National Society; and Archdeacon Smith having been for many years diocesan inspector of schools in the Diocese of Canterbury; all the seven in different degrees representing the Church and conservative view of education. The remaining eight members are divided into two parties; one consisting of the extreme section, who object to a large portion of the Report signed by the majority, and present a report of their own, including Mr. H. Richard, M.P., chairman of the Liberation Society (since deceased); the Hon. E. Lyulph Stanley and Dr. Dale, active members of the same Society, and the former for some years a member of the London School Board; Mr. T. E. Heller, secretary to the National Union of Elementary Teachers, and still a member of the London School Board; and Mr. George Shipton, whose name is well known in connexion with trades unions. The other and more moderate section of the party consists of three Liberal Members of Parliament, Sir John Lubbock, Bart., Sir Bernhard Samuelson, Bart., and Mr. Sydney Buxton, the last named of whom was for a time a member of the School Board for London, and appends a reservation to his signature to the effect that the arguments and evidence seem to him in favour of free schools

—the system to be not compulsory but permissive.

Having said so much of the persons constituting the Commission, we turn to the reports which they have respectively signed, and to a consideration of the principles on which they are framed. The Report of the Commission, for it is evident both from internal evidence and the names of the members taking part in the divisions published with the reports that the whole of the members assisted in framing it, consists of a volume of 236 pages, which is divided into an introduction. and nine parts, respectively headed: the Existing Law; the Existing State of Facts; Machinery for carrying on Public Elementary Education; Education and Instruction given in Public Elementary Schools; Government Examination, Parliamentary Grant, Income and Expenditure of Elementary Schools; Local Educational Authorities; Summary of Conclusions and Recommendations; Appendix. Then there is a minority report of the eight members who declined to sign the Report, giving the 'Reasons for Dissenting from the Report of the Majority, and a Summary of their own Recommendations.' This is a document of only thirteen pages; and there is also a third of the extreme minority headed as follows: 'We, the undersigned Commissioners, in addition to the Report dissenting from the majority, and summarizing our own conclusions, which we have already signed, beg to submit to your Majesty this further report, discussing more in detail the evidence taken by us, and the general position of Elementary Education at the present day.' This is a lengthy document of 142 pages, and has the appearance of a carefully prepared manifesto of some one holding extreme opinions, for which he desired to gain the publicity attaching to the report of a Royal Commission, and which in some places he seems to have modified to catch the signature of a colleague who was not prepared to go all lengths with him. We presume that neither this document, nor the one signed by the eight members, and giving their reasons for not signing the Report of the Commission, was ever seen by the majority until it appeared in print, and was published to the world. Briefly stated, it seems to us that the governing motive of the three reports is as follows.

thei dist men the and scho tary duri oper prov harn the a mine final to d dow not o cond so as the r regar and troul the e schoo must repre

1888

The

upo

do so if the volur cleve Mr. would count are so way,

that

are a

but

comp conta

VI 184

derate ers of elson, n was n, and at the chools

Comtively 1 they vident mbers s that ists of iction, ; the Public ven in Parliaentary Conere is a gn the port of tions.' is also e, the rt disoncluyour ail the entary ument epared which rt of a to have ot preneither rs, and ommisprint,

ems to

ollows.

The majority desire to remove difficulties which weigh heavily upon the voluntary schools, and which threaten to diminish their usefulness, to lessen their number, and possibly at some distant period to extinguish them. They desire to make elementary education as efficient as possible upon the lines of the existing system, removing hindrances to its development, and promoting harmony between the voluntary and the board school elements by giving equitable assistance to the voluntary schools, and removing evils which have come to light during the seventeen years that the Act of 1870 has been in operation. They do not propose to undo any of its essential provisions, but by certain adjustments to bring the law into harmony with what were throughout the professed aims of the authors of that Act. The three moderate members of the minority seem to accept the Act of 1870 as a substantially final settlement of the education question; they are willing to develop the education given under the conditions it lays down, where it can be shown to be possible, but they will not consider whether improvements may not be made in the conduct and arrangements with respect to voluntary schools. so as to remove the irritation which unquestionably exists in the minds of numberless friends of such schools; they seem to regard the principles on which the Act was framed as perfect, and in no case would they have Parliament and the country troubled with a re-discussion of them; if improvements in the educational machinery add to the difficulties of voluntary schools, they are sorry for it, but that cannot be helped, they must take their chance. The extreme section of the minority represent the Birmingham League. It is a trouble to them that voluntary schools with their distinctive religious teaching are allowed to exist: they would destroy them if they could: but as under existing circumstances that does not seem feasible, they would add to their burdens so far as they can do so under the guise of making education more efficient, and if the adoption of their proposals should hasten the end of voluntary schools, they would apparently feel that they had cleverly secured a most desirable object. In his last illness Mr. Forster said that he did not doubt that another effort would be made to secularize the elementary education of the country. Is it possible that the minority of this Commission are seeking to fulfil his prediction? Certainly, if they had their way, a considerable step would be taken in that direction.

Our readers will see that it is impossible, within the narrow compass of an article in a review, to examine all the proposals contained in the lengthy documents of which we have just

th

to

pi

CC

su

ne

be

CO

sh

th

ot

of

to

sec

M

cri

wh

wh

the

is

fro

As

mu

del

reli

dis

vid

sho

me

this

ina

nee

tha

go i

moi

mea

exp

It :

scho

for

to i

wou

spoken; the most we can venture to attempt is to give a brief sketch of the proposals by which each of the three sections of the Commission desires to attain its object, and to summarize as succinctly as we can some of the principal recommenda-This we shall endeavour to do by describing a few of the principal topics discussed from the several points of view. and not attempting to follow the reports through the more minute and technical headings under which the various aspects

of the question are grouped.

The first point treated of is naturally the supply of schools. The Education Department roughly estimates that schools should be provided for one-sixth of the population, and as there is now school accommodation for upwards of one-fifth of the population, or for more than a million beyond the required sixth, and as upon an average one-third of this accommodation, or more than a million and three-quarters of school places are unused, it would be difficult for either the majority or minority to ask for more schools to be built so long as the basis of calculation laid down by the Department is accepted. Whilst, then, there is on this hypothesis a sufficiency of school accommodation generally, there must arise frequently cases where, owing to the increase or shifting of the population, new schools are needed; and the question is by whom shall the deficiency be supplied? and who shall arbitrate when there is a dispute about it? At present the Act of 1870 places the determination largely in the hands of School Boards where they exist, and enables them absolutely to hinder volunteers from building schools, or, rather, from obtaining Government grants towards their support, if they should be built by private bene-The only check upon school board action is, that if they build themselves they cannot borrow for discharging the cost without the consent of the Education Department; but there is nothing to hinder their building if they can pay the whole of the expense out of the current rate. Under this regulation considerable hardships have arisen: to mention only one of the more flagrant as illustrative of the nature of the grievance. In the hamlet of Dan-y-Craig, within the area under the jurisdiction of the Swansea School Board, a considerable Roman Catholic population had settled for whom school accommodation was needed. The Roman Catholic priest proposed to build a school for these children, had plans prepared, and submitted to the Department. School Board, mainly consisting of the 'friends of religious liberty,' objected to a Roman Catholic school; in spite of the opposition of the children's parents the School Board thought

1888

a brief tions of marize mendafew of of view, e more aspects

schools. schools and as ne-fifth the reaccomf school najority g as the ccepted. f school ly cases ion, new I the dehere is a ne deterere they ers from it grants te benes, that if ging the ent; but pay the der this mention nature of thin the

nature of Ithin the Board, a ttled for Roman children, nt. The religious ite of the I thought the children ought to be compelled to attend board schools. which the parents conscientiously thought would be injurious to their highest interests, and in spite of entreaties and protests the Board built its school, and did its utmost to compel the children to attend it, the Department so far supporting them as to enable them to borrow what was The Report considers that such power ought not to be left in the hands of School Boards, but that the supreme control should rest with the Education Department, which should be allowed to exercise its discretion to prevent, on the one hand, unnecessary schools being built; and, on the other, to secure that no hindrance should be placed in the way of their erection when public-spirited religious people desire to provide them for their co-religionists. As our readers will see, even this leaves the advantage with School Boards, as a Minister of Education favourable to them could seriously cripple voluntary schools when he had such power in his hands.

In opposition to this the extreme party of the minority, who desire the destruction of voluntary schools, contend that whilst 'the Department should have all the powers given by the Act to compel School Boards to build efficient schools, it is of no advantage to education to prevent a School Board from establishing a school when they think one necessary.' As board schools can only be erected by taxing the community, and as experience has shown that a partisan majority delights in compelling those who conscientiously object to the religious teaching given in board schools to pay for what they dislike, it is necessary that some protection should be provided for minorities, and that some responsible officer of State should have more control than at present over the action of men inclined to act under the influence of party spirit. For this the majority contends; to this the minority objects.

Obviously the weak place of any voluntary system is its inability to find large sums of money whenever they may be needed; and as school building demands larger amounts at once than school maintenance, the extreme party is unwilling to let go this engine of destruction. As, therefore, it cannot say that more accommodation is needed so long as the present system of measuring wants and supply is accepted, it has hit upon the expedient of attacking the mode of measuring the supply. It says 'the time has come when even in well-arranged schools ten feet should be treated as the minimum floor space for each child in average attendance, and this should apply to infant schools as well as to senior departments.' This would diminish the estimate of the present accommodation

by nearly one-fifth, as the Department reckons eight feet sufficient for each child attending a voluntary school, and as upon an average one child in three of those whose names appear on the school rolls is always absent, this practically gives twelve square feet for each child that is present. anticipate this reply to their demand, the same party recommends that provision should be required by the Department for all the children whose names appear on the school roll. and not for those in average attendance. Such a demand would necessitate the fining of all schools that did not comply with it, as schools are now fined if the average attendance exceeds the number of children for whom the school is pro-To meet such a demand for space, school accommovided. dation (which would never be used) would have to be provided for about a million children, at a cost of not less than five million pounds, and those who make the demand no doubt anticipate (and that truly) that this would mean the destruction of a considerable number of voluntary schools, And for such destruction they proceed to make provision in their own interests, and for a further attack upon religious liberty, in their next recommendation, to which we proceed to call attention.

The point to which we refer, and about which there has been controversy, relates to the transfer of voluntary schools to School Boards. In some cases, owing to the poverty of a neighbourhood, but still more frequently owing to the incompetence or apathy of the managers, voluntary schools find themselves in pecuniary difficulties, and without funds wherewith to continue their operations. The Act of 1870 provides that by a vote of two-thirds of the managers and two-thirds of the subscribers schools may be handed over to a Board; but it gives no negative on such transfer to the trustees, in whom the property of the school is vested, or to public bodies which have contributed largely to their erection, or to diocesan or other authorities. It only permits those directly interested to state their objections to the Department. This has not infrequently operated unjustly, and the Church, or religious body which has found most of the money for building the school, has been permanently stripped of its property through the action of some incompetent or unpopular clergyman, who has arrayed his parish in opposition to him. Or it may be some wealthy person, who has erected a school at his own cost, or some active clergyman, who has collected the money needed for its erection, and has then removed to another part of the country, finds that his liberality or activity has not merely the and aver mor a land

1888

with ment origition expe

We

which

their concessions of the state of the state

'build aided mana trans with

desir

the

recor

Parlia poor, shoul the p feet and as

ames

cally

com-

ment

roll,

mand

mply

dance

pro-

mmo-

pro-

than

n the

hools.

ion in

igious

eed to

re has

ools to

neigh-

etence

selves

o con-

a vote

cribers

nega-

of the

ibuted

orities.

objecerated

found

erma-

some

To

been made useless by the supineness of those left in charge of the school, but turned to a purpose most repugnant to him, and the evil of a School Board, which he made sacrifices to avert, is inflicted upon the parish without his being able to do more than offer a remonstrance. Such action has produced a large amount of irritation, and an abiding sense of wrong, and the Commission proposes to remedy this by enacting

'that no transfer of a school held under trust should take place without the consent of a majority of the trustees, and that the Department should not sanction such terms of transfer as interfere with the original trust, beyond what is required for the purposes of the Education Act; and that provision should be made that no structural expenses, involving a loan, should be incurred without the consent of the trustees who lease the building' (p. 208).

We believe that this last proviso was inserted to meet cases which have arisen. The trustees of a school who have leased their building to a Board for a term of years, hoping at the conclusion of that period to be in a position to regain possession of it, and to reopen it for all the purposes for which it was erected, have found themselves checkmated by demands on which they had not reckoned. For the School Board to which the school was leased, desirous to retain possession, has at once proceeded to enlarge it or to build class-rooms (possibly unnecessary), or to make other so-called improvements, for which they have had to borrow a large sum, payable by instalments in sixty years, and thus have effectually put it out of the power of the proper owners, at whose cost it was built, to regain possession of their school.

The minority, and we regret to say in this case the whole of the minority, so far from wishing to lessen this grievance, desire to increase it, and to make it press more heavily upon the founders and supporters of voluntary schools. They recommend that

'buildings dedicated to the purpose of elementary education, and aided by a Parliamentary building grant, should, if the existing managers are unable or unwilling to conduct schools in them, transferred to the local authority (i.e. the School Board) charged with the duty of making sufficient school provision for the district; . . . and also that where any building which has been aided by a Parliamentary building grant exists for the elementary education of the poor, and is not used on weekdays for such purpose, the School Board should be entitled to have the use and occupation of the building for the purpose of supplying school accommodation for their district '(p. 246).

ed his ealthy some for its of the merely Probably the building grant did not amount to more than one-tenth, or at the most to more than one-sixth, of the cost of the building. Why those who provided nine-tenths or five-sixths of the cost should be compulsorily deprived of their property, because they are unable to sustain the cost of continuing the day school, we cannot see. If the demand had been that they should repay the Government grant before they were allowed to use the building for other than educational purposes, we could have seen justice in the demand. But as the conditions on which the building grants were given by the State simply amounted to this, that the school should be managed by a committee constituted in a particular manner, and be open to the visits of her Majesty's inspector, any such action as that proposed by the minority would be simply an act of confiscation, perpetrated by the action of the State, and would be destructive, so far as it went, of the whole theory of property.

In the face of such outrageous demands as those we have just described we feel it incumbent upon us to state that discontent, and along with it agitation, must continue to be intensified, if principles approaching to those advocated by the Birmingham League and championed by Mr. Lyulph Stanley and his friends on the Education Commission are in any way accepted. Justice to both sides is a very first condition for the settlement of this question. Sooner or later the people of the country will be made to understand what is done, and we have sufficient faith in our fellow-countrymen to believe that in the long run they will insist upon all parties being equitably dealt with. They have accepted the principle of religious liberty for all, and they will not permanently be deceived by such a one-sided application of it as is advocated by the minority of the Commission. Already there are symptoms of the growing unpopularity of School Boards, and the more they push their unjust claims, whilst their opponents are content with temperately resisting them, and demanding no more than simple equity requires, the more certainly will their unpopularity increase.

We turn next to the amount of help to be rendered by the State towards the maintenance of schools. And here it must be remembered that provision for elementary education differs from all other matters of which the State takes cognisance. School Boards were established by the Act of 1870 to supplement and not to supplant the system of education previously existing. That system was recognized as good, and, measured by the standard of efficiency demanded by the

De a s san the WO arm par def nize of the cou equ tha imp tha

spo

rate

ign

188

are he con Thi pos Lea with 50 1 pro in t crea the ance the and volu fees tion and the which men

nish

men

was

Oct.

than

cost

d of

st of

had

they

pur-

s the

State

aged

d be

ction

ct of

and

eory

have

t dis-

e in-

y the

anley

way

n for

eople

, and

elieve

being

le of

e de-

cated

e are

pards,

r op-

, and

more

Department, it cannot be said to be inferior to its rival. Such a system, therefore, cannot be looked upon as being in the same position as private charity in relation to relief under the Poor Laws, or as equipping of a soldier or a regiment would be in relation to contributions for the support of the army; for such contributions are not recognized by law as part of the State provision for the relief of distress or the defence of the country; whereas voluntary schools are recognized by the State as part of its provision for the education of the people. The voluntary schools are as much part of the national provision for the education of the children of the country as are the board schools. They are dealt with on equal terms by the Department, and they differ only in this: that in the voluntary schools a definite religious character is impressed upon them, which is lacking in board schools, and that they are managed by those who make themselves responsible for the cost of their maintenance, and not by the ratepayers. This fact must be borne in mind, as it is only by ignoring it that some of the just demands of voluntary schools are evaded.

When Mr. Forster introduced his Education Bill in 1870 he proposed that School Boards should be empowered to contribute out of the rates to the support of voluntary schools. This proposal was obviously equitable, and set forth the true position, but it was so vigorously opposed by the Birmingham League and Nonconformists generally that the Government withdrew it, and promised that in lieu of it an addition of 50 per cent. should be made to the Government grant. promise has been kept in the letter, but has not been fulfilled in the spirit; for the cost of carrying on schools has so increased that it has more than swallowed up the addition to the grant. In 1870 the cost of each child in average attendance was 11. 5s. 5d., of which the children's fees found 8s. 4\frac{1}{4}d., the Government grant 9s. $9\frac{1}{4}d$, voluntary subscriptions 6s. 11 $\frac{3}{4}d$. and endowments $3\frac{3}{4}d$. Last year the cost for each child in a voluntary school averaged 11. 16s. 4\frac{1}{2}d., of which the children's fees paid 11s. 1\frac{3}{4}d., the Government grant 17s. 0\frac{1}{4}d., subscriptions 6s. $7\frac{3}{4}d$, and endowments (many of them given since 1870) and sundry earnings of the school 1s. 63d. Therefore, whilst the Government grant had increased by 7s. 3d., the amount which the managers had to provide by subscriptions, endowments, letting their schools for concerts, &c., instead of diminishing, had increased by 11d. per child; and when it is remembered that the average attendance in voluntary schools was more than a million in 1887 beyond what it was in 1870,

ed by nere it cation cogni-1870 cation good, by the

188

the

sar

lim

sch

str

ass

wh

T

fro

eve

am

atte

to tim

the

tha

cor

of

be

of

sup

Th

gro

the

the

wh

wr

vo

sid

rea

to

the

IO.

pe

a t if

cla

WC to

au the

Sc

it will be seen that the demands upon voluntary benevolence are enormously greater than they were, instead of being diminished, as the friends of such schools were promised that they should be. In 1870 voluntary subscriptions furnished 418,839l. towards school maintenance for the year; in 1887, 743,737l. In addition to this the subscribers to voluntary schools have had to pay their full quota of the 5,270,717l. raised in School Board rates during last year in England and Wales. And beside this they have now to bear the whole cost of building and enlarging their schools, whereas previous to 1870 they had some help from Government.

Under these circumstances the Commission have recommended that the equitable claims of voluntary schools should

be recognized, and propose that

'the fixed grant should be increased to 10s, per child in average attendance, and that the conditions on which the variable portions of the grant are now made should be so far modified as to secure that the amount shall depend on the good character of the school, and on the quality of the acquirements of the great majority of the scholars. That schools should be assisted according to their deserts, so as to promote efficiency; whilst no undue pressure should be placed on dull children, and no unnecessary anxiety and worry caused to managers and teachers. That the average amount of the variable grant should in present circumstances be not less than 10s, per scholar' (p. 220).

This would make the maximum grant from the Department 11. If it were the average grant, it would not be in excess of what it speedily will be if the present rate of growth is continued. The estimated average for next year is rather more than 18s., and for some years it has annually increased by 3d. or 4d. But then, as matters are now managed, rich schools, where the fees are high and the expenses heavy, earn a guinea per child or more; whilst poor schools, which most need help, earn very much less. The proposal of the Commission would do much to equalise the grant by giving more where more is needed and ought to be given, and less when the opposite to this is the case. Moreover, it must be remembered that the maximum which could be earned would not represent the average sum that would be earned: so that the proposal of the Commission would be more likely to diminish than to increase the demands upon the Exchequer. They would abolish the present 17s. 6d. limit—for so long as it remains injustice must be done to poor schools, which are now heavily fined by its operation when they are very efficient, and in proportion to their efficiency: as matters now stand, the better they are

the more heavily are they punished for being good and at the same time poor. The Commissioners recommend that 'some limit should be placed on the cost of the maintenance of aided schools, due regard being paid to their efficiency without undue strain on local resources.' They also recommend that special assistance should be given to small rural schools on a plan of which the minority approve. They further recommend—

'That the local educational authority be empowered to supplement from local rates the voluntary subscriptions given to the support of every public State-aided elementary school in their district to an amount equal to these subscriptions, but not exceeding the amount of 10s. for each child in average attendance. Where a school attendance committee is the authority, the rate should be chargeable to the separate school district affected. The School Boards might in time, if not at once, be merged in the local authorities charged with the general civil administration. Every voluntary school might in that case receive some return from the rates to which its supporters contributed; while every ratepayer would be interested in the welfare of schools of this class, because he would know that the rates would be increased by the burden of supplying the place, out of the rates, of such of these schools as might cease to form part of the efficient supply of the district' (p. 195).

This extract from the Report shows to some extent the ground on which a claim to a portion of the rates rests; and the recognition of the claim would go far to put an end to the hostility between the supporters of the two sets of schools which now exists, and to that sense of irritation, injustice, and wrong with which the breasts of many of the supporters of voluntary schools burn. Moreover, viewed on its economical side, it is a proposal to which the ratepayers would have no reason to object. To take London as an example by which to illustrate its effect. The rate levied for the board schools there is 9d. in the pound; if the voluntary schools received 10s. for each child in average attendance it would not add a penny to the rate, whilst they provide education for more than a third of the children who attend school, and it is certain that if liberty were given to make such a grant it would only be claimed for a part of the children, who were eligible to receive it, on account of the condition annexed to it.

But it is objected that to allow such a grant to be made would be permitting a portion of the money raised by rates to be expended on schools over which the ratepayers had no authority. Those who raise this objection have not treated the proposal of the Commission fairly. That proposal is that School Boards may make such grants, not that they must: it

verage ortions are that ol, and of the

lence

dimithey

,8391.

,737l. have

chool

And

lding

they

ecom-

leserts, uld be caused ariable cholar

tment cess of s conmore by 3d. chools, guinea d help, would nore is site to at the nt the osal of to inbolish justice ned by

ortion

ey are

WO

pre

sch

wh

WO

gu

tea

sec

6 T

be,

wit

tha

Th

low

see

Th

tho

CO

not

sm

the

evi

jec

ind

effi

Mi

he

an

wo

in o

tea

bot

fix

mi

tion

res

sch

and

fro

to

is therefore only to give the ratepayers a freedom to which they are entitled. If they choose to entrust the spending of a portion of the funds which they are compelled to raise for educational purposes to voluntary managers, who not only manage more economically than School Boards, but are willing to contribute out of their own pockets a sum equal to what they receive from the local exchequer, why should an Act of Parliament forbid them? The fact is, the freedom of the ratepayers is stoutly insisted upon by the party of the Birmingham League when it is likely to act adversely to the Church, but it is to be rigorously restrained by Parliament when it might possibly work in a contrary direction.

Such a proposal is far too equitable and too completely in accordance with the principles of religious liberty to be approved by its professed friends, who seem far more eagerly set upon inflicting an injury on the Established Church than in supporting the principles which they inscribe upon their banners. This will be further seen by an examination of the proposals of the minority, and especially of the extreme portion of it, for the distribution of the Government grant.

They preface their recommendations with a warning that they are not quite satisfactory, and cannot be so until all voluntary management is destroyed, and universal School Boards estab-They desire that a large portion of the grant should be fixed, but they do not say how much; that 'more money should be paid to provide grants for teaching such subjects as cookery, science, and drawing, and for providing organizing masters and means of instructing the pupil teachers; that the remainder of the capitation grant, which is variable, should be apportioned among the various subjects of instruction, and that the inspector should look rather to the quality of the work than to the percentage of scholars who show some knowledge; that where the curriculum is fuller (i.e. where richer scholars attend, and secondary or semisecondary schools are set on foot) more money should be given; that special aid should be given to small village schools; and that the capitation grant should increase with the lowness of the school fee charged. They would preserve the 17s. 6d. limit, so that larger grants could only be earned by the wealthier schools, where expense was no object, which would include board schools and a very few voluntary schools in richer neighbourhoods. But all voluntary schools in poor neighbourhoods charging a low fee on account of the poverty of the children attending them would be as effectually cut off from increased help as they are at present.

LIM

which
ng of
se for
only
t are
ual to
ld an
om of
f the
to the
ament

Oct.

bletely be apagerly than their of the e por-

t they intary estabhould more such rovidpupil nich is ects of to the s who fuller semigiven; ; and ness of

7s. 6d.

by the

would ools in

poor

overty cut off As a condition of obtaining Government assistance they would 'pile up the agony' to a greater extent than it is at present, so as to make it still more difficult for voluntary schools to continue to exist, and to hasten the halcyon days when School Boards should become universal. For they would make all grants 'subject to the condition that better guarantees of efficiency be secured, both as regards buildings, teachers, and curriculum.' And they suggest, in order to secure uniformity of standard—

'That the quality of education to be secured to the children should be, as far as possible, uniform, and that we ought not to be satisfied with a lower standard in the country than in the town, in small schools than in large schools. . . . The inability of country children, as such, to learn as easily as town children has often been exaggerated. . . . The chief disadvantage of the country child is not his own want of power of learning, but the necessary smallness of the schools and the low salaries of the teachers, which result in most of the ablest teachers seeking town appointments' (p. 325).

The majority not less than the minority contend for thorough efficiency in all schools, but much more than this is covertly aimed at by this paragraph. It insinuates, if it does not assert, that a lower standard is required in country or small schools than in those in towns or that are large, whereas the inspectors and others assert in the clearest manner in their evidence that there is no such difference, but that in the subjects examined there is the same standard for all. The indefinite demand for better but undefined guarantees of efficiency proposed in the paragraph would enable a hostile Minister of Education to crush out of existence schools which he disliked.

Both the majority and minority recommend the putting an end to the present system of payment by results; but both would require that every child should be annually examined, in order to secure that it has a full amount of attention from its teachers, and as will have been seen from what has been said both recommend that a larger portion of the grant should be fixed; but all the majority except Lord Norton, and all the minority except Dr. Dale and Mr. Heller, would have a portion of the fluctuating grant depend in some way upon the results of the examination.

There are one or two other points affecting the finances of schools which it may be well to notice before turning to another branch of the subject. The annual income derived from the school fees paid by the children amounted last year to 1,833,985*l.*; each child in a voluntary school paying on an

average IIs. $1\frac{3}{4}d$. in the year, and each child in a board school 9s. $0\frac{1}{4}d$. The large sum raised in the aggregate from this source will show how important an item these school pence are in making up the income of all schools, and that for voluntary schools their continuance is essential. With regard to the payment of these fees the Report says:—

'If, as we think, provision of the due necessaries of education, as well as of the necessaries of life, is part of the responsibility incumbent on parents, it may well be believed that public contributions and private benevolence are already doing all that can be safely required of them in augmentation of the payments properly exacted from parents. On the whole, we are of opinion that the balance of advantage is greatly in favour of maintaining the present system established by the Act of 1870, whereby the parents who can afford it contribute a substantial proportion of the cost of the education of their children in the form of school fees' (p. 200).

Neither does the Commission recommend that the regulation of fees in voluntary schools should be entrusted to the Education Department, an effectual remedy, they point out, already existing against excessive fees, since the inspector can report a school to the Department where the fees are too high for the population, as unsuitable to form part of the school accommodation of the district.

We turn to what is said by the minority:-

'Many persons demand that fees should be abolished, though no definite scheme has been put before us showing how and at whose cost this is to be done. We are not agreed in principle on the question whether school fees should form a part of the sources of income for a national compulsory system of elementary education' (p. 340).

As to the question, Should the loss which would result from the abolition of school fees be made good from local or national sources? the answer given by the minority is, that they are compelled in the interest of education to conclude that no practical scheme of free education compatible with the continuance of the voluntary system has presented itself to them. They recommend that the Department shall secure that the fee shall not be beyond the means of the parents, but that School Boards should have the absolute power of fixing very low fees in their schools; that in no case shall the fee be raised as the child rises to a higher standard, and that one fee shall cover all charges against the child. The minority desire that the accounts of voluntary schools shall be audited by a public auditor, as they are not content with the audit by a local authority and H.M. inspector as at present. Both the Report

MIIX

b

a

11

e

a

tl

tl

fi

0

1888

board from school nat for regard

as well ent on private of them ts. On greatly Act of stantial ne form

reguted to point spector are too of the

ough no whose e ques-. 340).

result n local rity is, nclude vith the tself to ire that out that ng very e raised ee shall ire that public a local Report and the minority desire that better provision should be made for the payment of the fees for poor children by the Poor Law guardians when parents are not in receipt of relief from

The next point relates to the requirements concerning the Here all are number of teachers to be employed in a school. agreed so far as this, that the present demand of the Department is lower than it should be, and considerably lower than is actually found in most schools. The Report of the Committee of Council on Education for 1886-7 shows that the total staff of teachers then employed exceeded the Code minimum by 40 per cent., and as the percentage last year grew by nearly 4 per cent., whilst that of scholars in average attendance increased by about 3 per cent., the difference must now be somewhat greater than it was then. The Report therefore recommends that the minimum should be considerably raised, and suggests that the average maximum should be 40 for an ordinary class and 25 for the highest. The recommendations of the minority are not materially different. They propose that 'in future a head teacher should count for 40 scholars instead of 60, a certificated assistant for 60 instead of 80, and an ex-pupil teacher for 50, a pupil teacher in the third or fourth year for 30, and in the second year for 20, and that no others should be reckoned on the staff.'

The amount of school supply, the strength of the staff of teachers, and the means for supporting the schools, have now been examined; the next point to be considered is the instruction to be given. At present all learning is included in what the Code permits to be taught, and for which it is prepared to give grants. No school of the highest grade attempts to teach all the subjects for which the Education Department is prepared to make grants if taught in an elementary school; and, as the secretary of the Department informed the Commission, elementary instruction means whatever the Department decrees in the Code that it shall mean. This may possibly be one cause why these schools fail to accomplish much of the good that was hoped from them: little or nothing is taught thoroughly, and the great bulk of the children forget most of what they have learned soon after they have left school, because they have been taught superficially. The whole Commission, therefore, agreed in a definition of what is meant by elementary education, in the hope of securing an education which will really benefit those for whom it is provided. The Report thus sums up the recom-

mendations:-

'We believe that the quality of the education given in elementary schools would be greatly improved, if the Code contained several schemes of instruction, so as to provide for various classes of schools a curriculum varying in breadth and completeness with the number of scholars in attendance, and with the character and requirements of the population. Each scheme, however, should encourage the extension of the teaching of the necessary subjects beyond the prescribed limits. We recognize that in sparsely peopled rural districts the number of subjects taught must often be fewer than in schools situated in towns; but we are of opinion that even in small rural schools a larger measure of instruction might well be secured than that which includes only the three elementary subjects now required by the law, and we are of opinion that facilities should be given to managers to introduce other than the necessary subjects, in accordance with the varying circumstances of the localities. In making these recommendations we are well aware that it is possible to purchase an extension of the subjects of instruction at the cost of sacrificing that thorough grounding of the scholars in the rudiments of knowledge without which all teaching is superficial in character and transitory in result. And we desire to emphasize in the strongest manner our sense of the necessity of looking to the quality of elementary instruction at least as much as to its extent. The following are the subjects of elementary instruction which we regard as essential, subject to the various qualifications which we have already made: Reading, writing, arithmetic, needlework for girls, linear drawing for boys, singing; English, so as to give the children an adequate knowledge of their mother tongue; English history, taught by means of reading books; geography, especially of the British empire; lessons on common objects in the lower standards, leading up to a knowledge of elementary science in the higher standards' (p. 146).

The Report also proposes that 'the instruction to be paid for out of the rates and taxes should be limited by the legislature.' and it suggests that children of the wealthier classes should not be at liberty to attend schools so supported. To all these proposals the minority object. The aim of the Report is to hinder elementary schools from sliding into secondary schools supported by the ratepayers; to this the minority would have

With regard to the training colleges there is considerable diversity of opinion amongst the two sections of Commissioners. For some years efforts have been made by the secular and undenominational party to get rid of the denominational character of the colleges which belong to various religious bodies, and were chiefly erected, and are partially maintained, at their expense. To such a course the Report strongly objects, and the minority are content to waive their objections, though 'they cannot assent to the statement in the Report, that the

th th he lib

th

tea

18

th ist rat ea the the do tra

> ne an

> frie

tio

pa ha for VOC ing the fice of t

the

ren on wh sud the trai tea ami tea

rou edu

entary everal chools umber ements he excribed e numated in nools a which he law, gers to ith the mmentension orough without result. of the at least nentary s qualihmetic,

Oct.

paid for lature,' should ll these rt is to schools ld have

a, so as

ongue;

y, espe-

e lower

in the

derable ommissecular lational eligious atained, objects, though hat the existing system of residential training colleges is best, both for the teacher's and the scholars of the public elementary schools of the country; but they 'only acquiesce in the hope that the system of training now in force may be largely imitated here, in the association of training with higher education, in the great extension of facilities for day students, and in the liberal recognition of the rights of conscience.' They look to the adoption of these reforms to enable the country hereafter to dispense almost entirely with the employment of untrained teachers.

The Report recommends that the establishment of day training colleges should be encouraged by public grants, but that no portion of the sum needed for bringing them into existence or maintaining them should be furnished out of the To this last proposal the minority object, as they are eager for their creation, and would welcome any number of them. But eager as they are for such colleges, they object to the statement in the Report, 'that the Commissioners cannot doubt that the liberality of those who are anxious to see day training colleges provided will furnish whatever sums are needed,' and they think that experience does not justify such an assumption. The men who are most eager to compel the friends of voluntary schools to pay heavily towards their erection and maintenance, and who clamour for the complete or partial confiscation of the schools and colleges which they have erected, shrink from any demands upon their own purses for the furtherance of the principles and plans which they advocate. For our part we cannot see why those who are seeking to supply the educational wants of the religious portion of the community should be called upon to make greater sacrifices than are those who undertake the care of the education of that portion of the nation which is indifferent or hostile to the claims of religion.

The question of day or other training colleges was apparently much pressed upon the consideration of the Commission on account of the very large number of certificated teachers who have not been trained. The Act of 1870 caused a sudden and most rapid increase in the number of schools; for these, teachers were required in far greater numbers than the training colleges could supply. The gap was filled by ex-pupil teachers and others obtaining certificates upon passing an examination, and year by year the number of these untrained teachers is being added to, so that now they are more numerous than the teachers who have had the advantage of being educated in a training college. The Report recommends that

the stringency of this qualifying examination should be greatly increased, so as to diminish the number of persons admitted into the profession by this means; the minority also recommend much more stringent provisions; but they also desire what would seriously disturb existing arrangements, for they would prohibit all teachers who have not obtained their parchment from being placed in charge of a school, and would thus deprive the small country schools of the young acting and ex-pupil teachers upon whom they have hitherto relied, and so would greatly increase the cost of their maintenance; whilst the quality of the teachers in these schools would probably be deteriorated, as all the abler teachers would remain in the larger schools, and only those in weak health or of slender ability would be transferred to the small country schools.

The Report, whilst recognizing considerable defects in the manner in which many pupil teachers are now trained, and recommending improvements which would remedy these defects, regards with favour the system of pupil teachers as the most promising method of securing a good supply of efficient teachers, whilst it is at the same time the most economical. On the other hand, the minority 'strongly dissent from the proposition that, having regard to moral qualifications. there is no other equally trustworthy source from which an adequate supply of teachers is likely to be forthcoming,' but they fail to indicate any other source from which a sufficient supply could be drawn; they consider the pupil-teacher system the weakest part of our educational system, and would evidently rejoice to see its destruction. But as they are not prepared with an alternative plan they content themselves with proposing restrictions on those by whom pupil teachers are to be trained, and more costly ways of training them.

There is a wide diversity of view in the Report and the deliverance of the minority respecting compulsion. The former rejoices over the vast increase in the number of children attending school, and the absence of any serious opposition on the part of the wage-earning classes to compulsion, notwith-standing its grave interference with their homes. This they attribute largely to the gradual steps by which it has been introduced, and they consequently cannot endorse any general condemnation of the manner in which the compulsory laws have been administered. The minority take a different view, and condemn the manner in which compulsion has been administered. In their opinion the magistrates generally have failed adequately to support the local school authorities in enforcing the law. The facts given in the returns of the Edu-

th of no fif dr at ce

Ca

on So ab vig tur en att

mo

be

Th

rel

pe

offi ele dis kin app

clus

in that rud con some boul

be to o

VI 104

mitted ecomdesire r they parchd thus ig and and so whilst obably in the slender ols. in the ed, and ese dehers as

reatly

oply of st ecodissent cations, iich an ng,' but afficient ner sysl would are not mselves eachers eam.

and the eformer dren atition on notwithhis they been ingeneral ory laws ont view, oeen adlly have es in enthe Edu-

cation Department cannot be said to bear out this view of the case. In thirty-one English counties and in Wales more than one-sixth of the population have their names on the rolls of public elementary schools, and in some of these counties, notably agricultural counties, the proportion is nearly onefifth, in Leicestershire it exceeds that number. Of the children whose names are on the rolls the highest average attendance is found in Norfolk, where it reaches 79'29 per cent.; in Warwickshire and Westmoreland it exceeds 79 per cent., and in Bedfordshire, Berks, Dorset, Durham, Northumberland, Oxford, Rutland, and Worcestershire, it exceeds 78 per cent.; whilst in the area of the London School Board it only reaches 76.82, in Wales 73.79, and in Cornwall 70.88. So that in the parts of the country where School Boards most abound, and where the compulsory laws are probably most vigorously enforced, the attendance is lowest; in the agricultural counties, where the schools have to trust to moral influence, and not to the terrors of a compulsory law, the children attend school most regularly. The natural conclusion, therefore, from the facts before us is, not that compulsion should be more rigorously enforced, but that more dependence should be placed upon kindly persuasion by managers and teachers. This is an accomplishment in which the professed friends of religious liberty do not excel, and upon which apparently they place little reliance.

Both the Report and the minority recommend that the office of H.M.'s inspector be thrown open to the teachers in elementary schools; the extreme party of the minority are disposed to make practical experience as a teacher in some kind of school a necessary qualification for the inspectorate, apparently with the intention of eventually excluding such men as are now appointed, and drawing the inspectors ex-

clusively from the ranks of the teachers.

With respect to technical education the chief difference is in the authority to which the two parties in the Commission would entrust the management of it. The majority think that such education should include much more than mere rudimentary instruction, and would therefore commit the control of it to the municipal authority, with power to co-opt some leading persons engaged in the chief trades of the neighbourhood to direct what has to be done. The minority would commit the control of such education to School Boards, and would leave them such a margin of choice in the subjects to be taught as would practically enable them, if they so wished, to open secondary schools at the cost of the ratepayers.

VOL. XXVII.-No. LIII.

The question of secondary education has been somewhat complicated by the establishment of higher elementary schools, which differ materially in the different places where they have been established. The Report of the Commission makes the following recommendations respecting them:—

'Higher elementary schools are said to be meeting the actual wants of more people than are secondary schools, more especially because the former schools are cheaper. However desirable these higher elementary schools may be, the principle involved in their addition to our elementary schools should, if approved, be avowedly adopted. Their indirect inclusion is injurious to both primary and secondary instruction. If, therefore, the curriculum of higher elementary schools is restricted within due limits, avoiding all attempts to invade the ground properly belonging to secondary education, and if due precautions are taken to secure that promising children of poor parents should not be excluded from the privileges to be enjoyed in them, then we are of opinion that such schools may prove to be a useful addition to our school machinery for primary education' (p. 169).

It further adds:-

'A full consideration of the means now available for enabling promising scholars to proceed from the lower to the higher grades of schools convinces us that there are two wants not yet fully met. These are, first, that the supply of satisfactory secondary schools should be organized, and should be made adequate for the wants of all parts of the country; and secondly, that increased funds should be provided out of which to create sufficient exhibitions for deserving elementary scholars needing further instruction at those schools' (p. 171).

With these proposals the minority agree, only 'regretting the reserves which accompany some of the recommendations.' To us the proposals seem to go to the very extreme of what ought to be allowed by any system which is dependent to a considerable extent upon funds compulsorily raised from the tax and ratepayers of the country. It may be well to add that all the Commissioners agree in recommending a better provision for evening and continuation classes, in which those who desire to improve the education they have received in their childhood may have the opportunity of doing so. In our opinion more advanced classes of this kind ought not to impose any considerable charge on the finances of the country, as those for whom they are intended may be expected to be in a position to pay a moderate fee for the education they desire.

The Report calls attention to the great inconvenience caused by frequent changes in the Code, whilst it must be patent of design of qui ing exp mig that pos

188

to

be p Mar and scho bility cost ceass of th and upor men to be for a

assu

To pow schoothey

Parli shou pract as at woulment over spent altere

By a Repe pear the a

porti

ntary where ssion actual

what

these their wedly y and er eleempts n, and f poor yed in be a cation '

oromisschools ese are, be orparts of covided mentary

retting ations.' what it to a om the chat all ovision be who on their In our not to be councted to on they

caused patent

to every one how much evil could be effected by a Minister of Education who was an enthusiast for board schools, and desired to overthrow their rivals. By demanding higher requirements for the children before obtaining grants, by varying the grants themselves, by insisting upon extravagant expenditure on the schools or their appliances or staff, he might ruin numberless schools. The Report therefore asks that Parliament shall settle such requirements so far as is possible. It thus states its conclusion:—

'Whatever be the form which the Parliamentary grant may assume, we are of opinion that managers may reasonably ask not to be placed, in respect of it, at the mercy of the Ministry of the day. Managers, whether of voluntary or board schools, undertake onerous and laborious duties, in addition to which managers of voluntary schools incur not infrequently serious personal pecuniary responsibility. It therefore appears to us to be proper that the share of the cost of education, which is provided out of Imperial taxation, should cease to be dependent upon a Minute of the Privy Council—a survival of the earlier and more tentative phases of the education question—and should be protected, at least to a substantial extent, by the terms upon which the grant is awarded being embodied in an Act of Parliament. We would further recommend that when any changes have to be made in the Code it should henceforth lie before Parliament for at least two months, in print, before it comes into force '(p. 191).

To this the minority strongly object. It would limit their power of silently and unobtrusively destroying voluntary schools by making demands upon their finances with which they cannot comply. Their objections are thus stated:—

'We dissent from the recommendations, in the chapter on the Parliamentary grant, that the terms upon which that grant is awarded should be embodied in an Act of Parliament. That would mean in practice that the Code, instead of being issued by the Department, as at present, should be part of an Act of Parliament. Such a course would tend to stereotype education, to discourage and delay improvement, and would limit the future control of the House of Commons over their expenditure, as the money would have to be voted and spent in accordance with the terms of the Act, which could not be altered without the consent of both Houses of Parliament' (p. 246).

By a comparison of these words with the quotation from the Report given above, it will be seen that the results which appear to be dreaded are in no way such as would follow from the adoption of the proposal in the Report.

We have reserved to the last the consideration of that portion of the Report which is the most important, and which is at the root of all the differences of opinion amongst the Commissioners—we refer to the religious instruction to be given in elementary schools. The minority allege this difference, and the recommendation of assistance to voluntary schools out of the rates, as the special reasons for their not signing the Report. They 'object as much to the general tone and arguments of the Report as to its summary of conclusions,' and this remark must apply specially to what is said on the religious question, as the recommendation about rates is included in one or two paragraphs, and in no way colours the 'general tone and arguments of the Report.' The minority further say:—

'While we recognize that the formation of the character of the children attending our elementary schools is of paramount importance alike to the children, the parents, and the nation, we fear that the recommendations regarding religious instruction contained in the report of the majority would lead to a renewal of bitter disputes and rivalries which were and are happily subsiding' (p. 237).

Let us then turn to the proposals contained in the Report which are thus strongly objected to, that we may see how far they justify the accusation. The Report thus states what it considers ought to be the object and principles of education:—

'The object should be the elevation of those classes of the community for whom public elementary education is designed. The character of Englishmen has stood high for integrity, honour, perseverance, and industry, and has not lagged behind that of other nations in respect of patriotism and the social virtues. Our object is to preserve what has been good in the past from being tarnished in the future, and to improve and elevate our fellow-countrymen so far as possible. Whilst differing widely in our views concerning religious truth, we are persuaded that the only safe foundation on which to construct a theory of morals, or to secure high moral conduct, is the religion which our Lord Jesus Christ has taught the world. As we look to the Bible for instruction concerning morals, and take its words for the declaration of what is morality, so we look to the same inspired source for the sanctions by which men may be led to practise what is there taught, and for instruction concerning the help by which they may be enabled to do what they have learned to be right' (p. 113).

In this spirit the evidence given by a number of witnesses, and the proposals made by them, are examined, and the following conclusions are arrived at:—

'(1) That it is of the highest importance that all children should receive religious and moral training. (2) That the evidence does not warrant the conclusion that such religious and moral training can be amply provided otherwise than through the medium of elementary

the sho reg sch (ibi

Be

the

led

18

scl

pa

rig

tak

pa

de

the

It

in insparation in ins

the (p.

relig eduimp amo

dou

cont

And

valu syste be difntary r not neral conat is about way

Oct.

of the rtance at the in the es and

The

deport ow far hat it on: e com-. The persef other object rnished men so cerning n which duct, is

men so cerning n which duct, is ld. As take its he same led to he help d to be

the fol-

n should ace does ning can ementary schools. (3) That in schools of a denominational character to which parents are compelled to send their children, the parents have a right to require an operative conscience clause, so that care be taken that the children shall not suffer in any way in consequence of their taking advantage of the conscience clause. (4) That inasmuch as parents are compelled to send their children to school, it is just and desirable that, as far as possible, they should be enabled to send them to a school suitable to their religious convictions or preferences' (p. 127).

It is added :-

'We are also of opinion that it is of the highest importance that the teachers who are charged with the moral training of the scholars should continue to take part in the religious instruction. We should regard any separation of the teachers from the religious teaching of the school as injurious to the moral and secular training of the scholars' (ibid.)

Besides this, the Report recommends that in board schools there should be an annual examination in religious knowledge corresponding to that made by the diocesan inspectors in Church schools, and they say:—

'We have found with regret that in recent years this branch of the inspector's duty (examination into the moral tone and condition of a school) has not received the attention it deserved; we therefore think it necessary to recommend that it should be the first duty of Her Majesty's inspectors to inquire into and report upon the Moral Training and condition of the schools under the various heads set forth above, and to impress upon managers, teachers, and children the primary importance of this essential element of all education' (p. 127).

These recommendations and the remarks in the Report are thus criticized by the minority:—

'In reference to the recommendations of our colleagues as to the religious and moral training, we repeat our strong opinion that in the education of the young the formation of the character is of the highest importance. But, having regard to the great diversities of opinion among our countrymen on religious subjects, and having serious doubts whether moral training can be satisfactorily tested by inspection or examination, we do not believe that the recommendations contained in this portion of the report of our colleagues would promote the object which we desire' (p. 244).

And again:-

'While we insist upon moral teaching and believe that more systematic moral teaching if given with earnestness would have a very valuable influence on the characters of the scholars, we think that any systematic inspection of morals by Her Majesty's inspector, such as is

18

ar

of

tei

res

lib

ho

be

th

Th

ele

an

cre

arl

rai

the

sui

vio

ne

thi

we

OW

tis

Or

tha

sul

the

wh

sch

A

wh

vie Su

ha

on

Ca

do

Su

WO

suggested in the chapter on the Parliamentary grant, would not only be of no value, but would, where the local managers and teachers did not themselves feel the importance of moral influences, be of positive injury as leading to hypocritical and mechanical teaching of that which must come from a free expression of conscientious conviction ' (p. 246).

The frequent reference in the Report to religious training as the basis of all real and abiding moral instruction that is to have an influence upon the lives and characters of the children, and the omission of all reference to it in the report of the minority, are points to be noted. In the chapter on religious instruction by the extreme section of the minority, they labour to prove that 'the schools of the Church of England and of the Roman Catholic Church are rendering to those great ecclesiastical organizations a larger service than they ever rendered before;' and much evidence by Nonconformist witnesses is cited to show the strong objections felt by influential bodies of persons to the teaching of religion in elementary schools subsidized by the State; there are also elaborate statements about Sunday schools, the importance attached to them, and the great number of children attending them, and there are tables of statistics arranged by Dr. Dale to show the number of children who have their names on the books of Sunday schools. In one of these tables, the numbers being arranged under four heads-Church of England, Wesleyan, Sunday School Union, and other Protestant denominations-no reference is made to the fact that many Church Sunday schools are in union with the Sunday School Union; so that the children attending them should be counted amongst those being taught by the Church and not by Nonconformists. With such an addition the result would be that more than one-half of the whole are in Church schools. But it must be borne in mind that these arguments, if by courtesy they may be called such, do not touch the grievance of Churchmen and the friends of definite religious They contend that out of deference to their scruples no part of the school rates paid by Nonconformists can be applied to the schools where definite religious teaching is given; whilst the whole of the school rates which they are compelled to pay are applied to the maintenance of schools to whose religious teaching, or want of it, they altogether object, and that no part of their money can be given for the maintenance of schools which they approve, although those schools are as much recognized by the State as are the others, and give as good an education as do the others, and

chi que wh gro aga

nly be rs did posing of s con-

Oct.

ining hat is chilort of n reli-, they gland those they ormist by inon in also rtance ttendby Dr. names es, the Engestant many School ld be nd not would hurch ments, ch the ligious their rmists teachh they nce of y altogiven hough

are the rs, and are as much a part of the national provision for the education of the rising generation as are any other schools. They contend that they have the same right to have their consciences respected as the Nonconformists have; and that if religious liberty is to be more than a name and a party cry, those who hold a definite faith and desire to have it taught to those who believe with themselves, have in equity an equal claim upon the public funds with those who have no such faith or desire. The answer that one set of schools is managed by persons elected by public suffrage, whilst the other set is not, is no answer, inasmuch as the difference is made, not by the discretion of the ratepayers or their representatives, but by an arbitrary rule enacted by Parliament, which deprives the

ratepayers of all control on this all-important point.

As so much is said in the report of the extreme section of the minority in favour of Sunday schools being regarded as sufficient instructors in religious knowledge, and of their providing all that is needed, it may be well to note that the witnesses before the Commission who spoke most strongly in this sense gave no detailed information to show that they were doing more than giving the general impression of their own minds. They made no claim to having gathered statistics of the subject, and without this, assertion is valueless. On the other hand, the Rev. R. B. Burges told the Commission that a few years since there was a thorough sifting of the subject at Birmingham, when statistics were gathered from all the schools, and it was found that there were 26,000 children whose names were borne on the rolls of elementary day schools which did not appear on those of any Sunday school. A return from the schools of the School Board of London, which we have been permitted to see, certainly supports the view that many attend day school who are not found in Sunday school. That return shows that whilst 54,993 children had their names on the rolls of Church Sunday schools, 34,905 on those of Nonconformist schools, and 996 on those of Roman Catholic schools, there were 75,137 who were unclassified and doubtful, most of whom, it is to be presumed, did not attend Sunday school. And it must be remembered that those who would attend no Sunday school would be the most neglected children, and the children of the worst parents. It is a serious question for secular as for religious authorities to consider, whether it is safe for the State to allow a large population to grow up ignorant of Christianity, and without those restraints against lawlessness and violence which religion provides.

The friends of religious education are not to be frightened

by the threats which the extreme section think it right to throw out. They say :---

'In our opinion it would be a grave mistake, from the point of view of those who attach the greatest importance to the religious instruction given in day schools, if any attempt were made to disturb the settlement of 1870 by compelling all schools receiving aid from the Parliamentary grant to provide religious instruction. Any such attempt would be certain to provoke angry controversy and resolute resistance, and might end in diminishing rather than increasing the amount of the religious teaching now given in public elementary schools' (p. 293).

Those who penned and subscribed this sentence ought to know that no such proposal is made in the Report by the friends of religious education; and for them to introduce such a topic looks like an attempt to draw a herring across the path. We are quite content that secularists, unbelievers, and misbelievers should have their schools, although we scarcely need say we regret that there are people who desire such schools, and we have no wish to interfere with them. we demand is that the same liberty should be accorded to us and other believers as is accorded to them; and that our money should not be applied compulsorily to schools from which by law is excluded what we believe ought to be taught, when a majority of those who pay the rates desire that it should be taught, and that in any case where there is a school rate some portion of it may be applied where definite religious instruction forms part of the curriculum.

It is impossible for the friends of definite religious teaching to be altogether satisfied with the Report of the Education Commission, since it has not recommended the repeal of the Cowper-Temple clause by which this gross infringement of the principle of religious liberty is inflicted. Report seeks to diminish the injustice by proposing that the denominational schools should receive some help from the funds which their friends are compelled to pay to the educational provision for the country; and we dislike agitation and controversy so much that we might not be unwilling to accept the proposed compromise; but that even then a wrong would be inflicted we do not hesitate to say, and we cannot understand how the persons who objected to Church rates can oppose the proposal for all to be aided out of the fund to which all contribute, except on the principle that they do not object to religious inequality, or even to religious intolerance or persecution, but that what they object to is that they should 188 be

be

with the any mode a constant

one

sch are Th ver the vot me wh me diff the the the con sto assa may who it i

fair mai it w tion mor larg dim

sch

sch

tem

succ

hav of t

view structhe the such solute g the

at to y the such s the , and rcely such What to us t our from ught, hat it chool

eachducarepeal
ringeThe
at the
ducatation
ing to
wrong
annot
rates
ind to
lo not

erance

hould

be the sufferers, not the inflicters, of what is disliked or felt to be unjust and irritating.

It is scarcely necessary for us to express our disagreement with the remainder of the long, one-sided, partisan report of the extreme section of the minority. It will be enough for any fair-minded person to read it to see that it savours more of a publication of the old Birmingham League than of a carefully written, well-balanced statement of the present state of the education question. We will illustrate this by

one or two examples.

They claim 'that even apart from the questions of large schools and the power of levying money by rate, School Boards are more likely to prove efficient than voluntary managers.' Those who know anything about School Boards are aware that very few of their members ever took the slightest interest in the subject of education until they were elected by a party vote on to the Board, and that the great majority of the members never enter a school belonging to the Board. whole business is generally managed by one or two active members just as voluntary schools are; but then there is this difference in favour of the managers of voluntary schools, they have to evince their interest in the cause by dipping into their own pockets and not into those of their neighbours for the support of their schools; whilst their presence on the committee of a voluntary school cannot be made a steppingstone into public life, or afford an opportunity for publicly assailing religious institutions which they dislike, such as may be found by their becoming members of a School Board whose proceedings are chronicled in the newspapers. But it is stated that the Government grant earned by board schools is somewhat higher than that obtained by voluntary This is easily accounted for. By the present system cram does much to secure success, and 'cram' to be successful requires a large number of teachers. Board schools, having an unlimited command of money, multiply the number of teachers, and consequently the cost of maintenance. A fair comparison between the two demands that both cost of maintenance and grant should be taken into account. Then it will be seen that by expending 8s. 3d. more on the education of each child, board schools are enabled to earn 123d. more upon an average; and, as the board schools are much larger generally than voluntary schools, this ought greatly to diminish the cost of supporting them.

There is an assertion in the report, signed, we regret to

say, by the whole of the minority, for which we cannot find any justification in the evidence. They state:—

'We are of opinion that the evidence rather points to the fact that, owing to the poverty of the voluntary schools, some of the inspectors have lowered their standard to a minimum, lower even than the Code, for fear of shutting up schools which depend on the grant for existence, and which yet fall below the standard of teaching which would deserve recognition and payment, and that this is the danger against which it is most important to guard, and not a tendency to make the examination too difficult' (p. 242).

We have looked carefully through the evidence, and we can find no trace of any support for such an opinion from any witness whose testimony on such a point carries any weight. H.M.'s inspectors indignantly repudiate the idea, though pressed upon the point by at least one member of the Commission; teachers are quite unaware of it; but some virulent opponents of voluntary schools assert it, and their knowledge must have been derived from their own inner consciousness, and not from personal acquaintance with schools with which they are wholly unconnected, and therefore can in no way justify the minority in stating that the evidence points to the fact that some of the inspectors have lowered their standard in favour of voluntary schools.

The best repudiation of such a charge is found in the Report:—

'One and all of the inspectors examined disclaimed any conscious variation in the test which they applied to the various classes of schools which they visited, and we do not see reason to believe that there is any ground whatever for the imputation on the part of the inspectors of partiality in the discharge of their onerous duties' (p. 76).

Then there is a long chapter in the report of the extreme section on the grievances of Nonconformists, from which even Mr. Lyulph Stanley and Mr. Heller find it necessary to partially disagree. Its object is to prove the inadequacy of the conscience clause to protect the children of Nonconformists from teaching which they disapprove, and to urge the importance of the universal establishment of School Boards.

In this, as in all other parts of this report, the rights of those who desire a religious education for their children are not recognized as being in any sense upon an equality with those who desire no such education. The teaching of religion is looked upon as a luxury in which people are not to be indulged unless they are content to pay for it out of t the mat may pros to w is 1 thos Wh allo Son

salv

hos

to o

don

1888

ance school us in which for the and we speed men nest of t

which

the

succ

St.

IF M

1888

et that, bectors an the ant for which danger

ncy to

t find

re can
n any
reight.
hough
Comrulent
vledge
isness,
which
o way
to the
ndard

nscious sses of ve that of the duties'

in the

ctreme h even artially se cons from ortance

ghts of en are quality aching ole are it out of their own pockets. What the effect of this would be upon the spiritual, moral, and social well-being of the nation is a matter which the advocates of such a principle seem to think may take care of itself. England has become a great and prosperous nation under the system which they would destroy; to what the adoption of the principle for which they contend is likely to lead may be seen in France. Religion is one of those things about which there cannot long be neutrality. When its principles cease to be inculcated, and children are allowed to grow up in ignorance of those truths which the Son of God came down from Heaven to teach, and of that salvation which He purchased for mankind, a bitter feeling of hostility to it is speedily kindled, and a nation rushes blindly to overthrow all that can remind them of it, as is now being done in France.

We trust that those who agree with us as to the importance of preserving definite religious teaching in elementary schools, whatever may be their religious belief, will unite with us in contending earnestly for that liberty of religious teaching which we believe to be essential for the welfare of this and for every other empire. We recognize in the proposals of the Commission improvements upon the system now in force; and, though they are far from containing all we could wish, we can heartily desire that their recommendations may speedily have the effect of law. To secure this we trust that men will be content to sink minor differences and act earnestly together to secure the ameliorations of the present state of things which are proposed, and that they will neither be terrified by the shouts of opposition and threats of vengeance which the secularist party are certain to raise, nor shrink from the toil and efforts which are certain to be needed to secure success.

SHORT NOTICES.

St. Peter, Bishop of Rome; or, the Roman Episcopate of the Prince of the Apostles, proved from the Fathers, History, and Archwology, and illustrated by Arguments from other Sources. By the Rev. T. Livius, C.SS.R., M.A., Oriel College, Oxford. (London: Burns & Oates, 1888.)

If Mr. Livius has succeeded in little else, he has at any rate given a magnificent example of the noble art of book-making, and has shown

how it is possible to construct a volume of 560 pages with an unlimited use of scissors and paste and an infinitesimal amount of original research. We do not for a moment accuse him of plagiarism, for he confesses his obligations like a man, but for all that he is guilty of book-making of a most unblushing character, and his work is not redeemed by any clearness of method or lucidity of exposition. A short account of the contents will, we think, justify our remarks, especially as we shall for the most part quote his own words.

He divides his treatise into three sections: the first contains the historical evidence, the second the archæological, the third more general arguments and discussions bearing on St. Peter's Roman episcopate. 'The first part is almost entirely a translation,' writes Mr. Livius, 'from the Latin of Professor Jungmann's Dissertatio prima, De Sede Romana S. Petri, Principis Apostolorum.' Of the second part he says: 'I have availed myself with utmost freedom of the generous permission granted me by the Very Rev. Provost Northcote and the Very Rev. Canon Brownlow to make whatever use I pleased of their well-known Roma Sotterranea. This is almost the exclusive source of the first four chapters of the second part.' The fifth chapter contains seven pages of extracts from other authors. The sixth chapter is, as far as we can judge from its style, purely original, but is followed by a note of three pages taken almost entirely from the *Roma Sotterranea*. The third part—we again quote Mr. Livius-'I may call in some sense my own work. But from such claim I must, as is plain, make large deductions, and must except the lengthened extracts I have made from the Blessed John Cardinal Fisher, Baronius, Murray, Döllinger, Cajetan, Franzelin, from the admirable volumes of Mr. Allies and other authors, references to whose writings are given in foot-notes.' We may add that the quotations are very large indeed. Mr. Livius is so very honest in making his confession that he disarms some of our criticism, and reminds us that it is possible to commit almost any fault in this country without losing much in public estimation, if we only own up to it sufficiently boldly.

These extracts, which form the staple of the Nor is this all. book, are often put together without any regard to their relevancy or appropriateness. Chapter II. of Part II. has nothing to do with St. Peter, being an account of catacombs in which there is no memorial of him. Chapter V. is mainly devoted to extracts from other writers giving an account of St. Peter's residence in Rome, and has nothing to do with archæology at all. We might assume that the first part, which contains the translation of Professor Jungmann's dissertation, would be sufficient for the historical part of the subject; but in the third part Mr. Livius finds it necessary to go over a great part of the ground again, or rather to quote other writers who do so. When we find the argument of a chapter on the doctrinal consequences of St. Peter's Roman episcopate interrupted to introduce a passage from Dr. Döllinger to prove that the martyrdom at Rome was a reality (which question is discussed in various other places of the book), or when we notice at the end of another chapter the words, 'We think it will 188

mi H

eitl wri

the

Ch

of]

of to

prin

nes arti cilie ridi sou Our mal seri Liv very

lose

grap

with

pers the poir two, Cyp latin care anot Ron

Alpl pola give ther quot directext Uni an ununt of

iarism.

he is

s work

osition. marks.

ins the

more

Roman

' writes

sertatio

Of the

dom of

Provost

hatever almost

d part.'

uthors.

purely

ost en-

quote

it from d must

d Tohn

anzelin,

s, refer-

honest

sm, and in this

own up

of the

ancy or

with St.

emorial writers

thing to

t, which

aird part

ground

find the

. Peter's

Dr. Döl-

(which

when we

k it will

not be without interest to our readers if we supplement this chapter by the following extract from Dr. Döllinger,' we are irresistibly reminded of the boy who in an examination wrote, quite irrelevantly, 'Here it may be not out of place to give a list of the kings of Israel and Judah.'

Nor is Mr. Livius's style any better than his arrangement. In such chapters as are the writer's own, it consists for the most part of either reckless assertion or somewhat violent abuse. On p. 439 he writes:—

'No one who knows history at all can safely deny—what, indeed, all the world is persuaded of—that from primitive days the several ages of Christendom have borne continuous witness that the Roman episcopate of Peter has been held to be the historical embodiment or crystallization of the Divine word: Tu es Petrus.'

This statement absolutely begs the whole question. As a specimen of his controversial style take the following:—

'They teem with wild and arbitrary eclecticism, negation of all fixed principle and definite standard of truth, heedless assumptions, lawlessness, irreverent disregard—nay, contempt—of authority, gross yet most artful misrepresentation, wholesale vituperation, joined to a pose of supercilious peremptoriness and overweening self-assertion that would be only ridiculous, were it not for the saddening thought of the many good simple souls that are made its dupes '(p. 440).

Our chief reason for quoting this passage is that, as far as we can make out, it refers to ourselves. A few years ago a very remarkable series of articles appeared in our pages on the Petrine claims. Mr. Livius never refers to them directly, but from time to time makes very pointed references to them, and, from the way in which he loses his temper, we can only infer that he finds some difficulty in grappling with them; at any rate, he never attempts to try conclusions with us. For our part, we are quite willing to let any competent person judge whether we deserve the charges brought against us in the extract quoted.

The work being so lengthy it is impossible to touch upon all the points which invite criticism. We shall confine ourselves to one or two, and will, we think, find the manner in which quotations from Cyprian are treated not uninstructive. On p. 19 (when he is translating Professor Jungmann's treatise), Mr. Livius quotes Cyprian, carefully avoiding the interpolated words. On p. 259 we have another discussion of the historical fact of St. Peter's episcopacy at Rome. Towards the end of the chapter a quotation from St. Alphonso Liguori is inserted, which quotes as genuine the interpolated passage in Cyprian, De Unitate Ecclesice, 'The primacy is given to Peter that the Church may be set forth as one.' Nor is there any hint given that there are doubts on the genuineness of the quotation. On p. 524, where the author, as far as we know, is not directly indebted to anyone, he adopts a third method. In the text he quotes a long interpolated passage (again from the De Unitate Ecclesiae), then in a note he adds, 'If anyone objects to

the Benedictine text as represented above, we here give that adopted in the Oxford Translation.' This text is, as a matter of fact, totally different, occurring in the Benedictine edition after the interpolated passage, and in no way proving what the author wishes to prove. Now, if Mr. Livius is as simple-minded as this implies, we ask him before he writes any further on ecclesiastical history to study some of the principles of textual criticism (he can find some good guides in his own Church), and then he will learn that it is not a matter of indifference whether a late gloss is accepted as part of the text or We only hope that it is simple-mindedness, and not a device of the writer for getting the benefit of the passage without committing himself. At any rate, no one can be considered competent to discuss an historical question who in any way admits the historical value of a passage so utterly without support as that interpolated into the text of Cyprian. We may add that there are various places throughout the book in which the author quotes in support of his views writers of the seventeenth century who base their statements on documents such as the pseudo-decretals now admitted to be forged, and that Professor Jungmann seems to quote the life of Cletus in the Felician Catalogue as authentic history (p. 91).

We do not intend to rediscuss the historical question; those who wish can refer to our previous articles on the Petrine claims,1 but there are certain arguments in this book which claim to be more or less novel. One is that of Professor Jungmann (p. 12). He argues that St. Peter must have been Bishop of Rome because the belief in his episcopacy was the cause of the historical papacy—the papacy is a fact, therefore the cause must be so. Moreover, it is impossible to believe that so great an historic fact can be based on a lie. To this it is sufficient to reply that the pseudo-decretals are admittedly not genuine, that they form the basis on which the Canon Law is built, and that the reality of the Canon Law does not prove the genuineness of the Decretals; so that the Canon Law is an historical fact, and is undoubtedly based on a lie. In the case of the Petrine claims, what is proved is the reality of the belief in St. Peter's Roman episcopate, not its truth; there were many other causes which helped to produce the historical papacy, and the combination of good and evil for which it was distinguished are the natural results of its origin -partly based on what is true, partly on what is false.

Mr. Livius claims that in two points he has brought out the strength of some evidence more clearly than has been done before. These are the evidence from archæology and that from tradition. With regard to the first he says:—

'For we must bear in mind that the testimonies found in the catacombs on behalf of St. Peter are of the very same nature and force as those producible from others who have passed under our notice; with this difference, however, that the evidences in favour of St. Peter are manifold more numerous than those for the former' (p. 130). fails an ac in what tery clogic and scatac centus St. P force extra peris

1888

which word was I come it is a be she ten t tradit the a the E hund origin P historians.

which whole sumpt and c impor expres

One 'com

prove

a 'con fact is way it to poi year a from

M critici article Light

¹ See Church Quarterly Review, vol. vii. p. 1; vol. viii. p. 1; vol. ix. p. 482, 1878–82.

ct.

ed

lly

ed

ve.

im

ne

es

of

or

ce

it-

to

cal

ed

ces

his

on

ed.

he

ho

out

or

ies

in

is

to

his

not

ilt,

ess

l is

nan

ped

and

gin

the

ore.

on.

ata-

as

with

. ix.

This is one of the many statements which Mr. Livius absolutely fails to substantiate. The chapter in which the words occur contains an account of the cemetery of St. Domitilla, perhaps of the first century, in which there is absolutely no reference to St. Peter, and of the cemetery of St. Sebastian, where a tradition, of which there is no archæological evidence earlier than the fourth century, asserts that St. Peter and St. Paul rested. Mr. Livius himself dwells upon the fact that the catacombs contain considerable remains of the Church in the first two centuries, butabout St. Peter they have nothing before the third; about St. Peter as Bishop of Rome nothing before the fourth century. The force of this he seems himself to feel, for he adds a note (which is extracted from the Roma Sotterranea) to explain why so much has perished which ought to have survived.

He dwells also at great length on the evidence of tradition, by which he means the quantity, not the quality of tradition, or, in other words, that after a certain period it was always asserted that St. Peter was Bishop of Rome. But if a mistaken view of history once becomes current, it does not become more true by the number of times it is repeated. If the tradition of St. Peter's Roman episcopate can be shown to date from the third or fourth century, it may be repeated ten thousand times and be none the more true. The value of a tradition depends on the character of its source, not on the width of the area over which it spreads. The belief in the immoralities of the English monasteries does not become any the more true because hundreds of historians have continued to repeat the statement, if the

original evidence was tainted.

Professor Jungmann and Mr. Livius have one or two canons of historical criticism which it is perhaps worth our while to notice. One is to look upon the whole story of St. Peter's episcopate as a 'complex' fact, and consider that whatever proves any part of it proves the whole. Professor Jungmann in a passage, to the style of which Mr. Livius gives the sincerest form of flattery, says (p. 12):—

'All these several testimonies taken singly point implicitly to the whole complex fact. . . . We say this because some heretics with presumptuous sophistry and cunning fraud have endeavoured so to divide and classify the various testimonies as to set aside entirely as of no importance those in which the episcopate of Peter until his death is not expressly mentioned.'

The discreditable story of Alexander Borgia and his daughter is a 'complex' fact, but no one would consider that the whole 'complex' fact is proved by the evidence that he had a daughter. In the same way it is hardly a case of 'presumptuous sophistry and cunning fraud' to point out that almost all (if not quite all) the evidence up to the year 250 in favour of St. Peter's visit to Rome never calls him, apart from St. Paul, Bishop of Rome.

Mr. Livius again has a particular objection to any historical criticism which dwells on the fact that witnesses disagree. In the articles above alluded to we had pointed out (as also do Bishop Lightfoot, Professor Lipsius, and the Abbé Duchesne) that the early lists of Roman bishops are untrustworthy because they disagree

so much among themselves. This it is which calls down upon our heads the words of denunciation already quoted. For to Mr. Livius all evidence is equally good, whatever its date and however doubtful in character. The historical proof of the Petrine claims consists of stringing together extracts without criticism and without

regard to their authority.

There is one point more to which we wish to advert, and that is the assertion which is definitely made that 'St. Peter's Roman episcopacy is certain with the certitude of infallibility' (p. 3). This we think explains the whole difference between a Roman controversialist and ourselves. He starts with the assumption that what he wishes to prove is true; any evidence therefore in support is welcome, and anything that contradicts it must be untrue. But this is really reversing the proper order of logical proof. It is a very circular mode of arguing to make the dogmatic statement corroborate the historical fact and the historical fact bear witness to the dogmatic statement. What anyone who examines the Roman claim demands is some clear and certain evidence that St. Peter was not only Bishop of Rome but also Head of the Church, and handed his power on to his successors; and if he examines the historical evidence he not only does not find enough to support the enormous structure that is reared on it, but finds that there is no really early evidence at all in favour of the separate episcopate of Peter at Rome.1

The Teaching of the Apostles, newly edited with facsimile text and a commentary for the Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, from the MS. of the Holy Sepulchre, Jerusalem. By J. RENDEL HARRIS, formerly Fellow of Clare College, Cambridge, Professor of Biblical Languages and Literature in Haverford College, Pennsylvania. (London: C. J. Clay and Sons, Cambridge University Press Warehouse. Baltimore: Publication Agency of the Johns Hopkins University. 1887.)

This sumptuous volume, if one of the last, is by no means one of the least important or least interesting of the many contributions which theological scholarship in England and America has made towards the illustration of Archbishop Bryennios' great discovery. Nor is the gratitude we feel for it the less because we have to express it in more than one quarter. To a dignitary of our own communion, Dr. Charles R. Hale, dean of Davenport Cathedral, Iowa (who has been among us in England during the present summer), for originating the idea of a photographic reproduction of the manuscript, and to his Blessedness the Patriarch of Jerusalem, under whose immediate care the now celebrated codex is preserved, for his consent; to Mr. Gillman, United States Consul at Jerusalem, who immediately supervised the undertaking, and to Professor Rendel Harris, who has edited the facsimile with introduction and critical studies; to the Johns Hopkins University, which accepted the responsibility

¹ One of the most able and temperate discussions of the whole question is that in Langen's Geschichte der Römischen Kirche.

for the

1888

suran siven than manu Strasl of ac dange Laure Engli uniqu salem

B

most

most

sor H is nev the s gence Herm tions, sixth o single with it mon n To be tors of Cleme shalt le on the referen to thin than th regrette of his nothing Alexan the par andria, are not by Mr. and Ale and a S We yet rem

mutual

Church VOL.

pon Mr.

ever

ims

nout

t is epi-

s we

ver-

t is But

is a

cor-

s to

man

eter

the

t the

is no te of

nd a

from

NDEL

essor

llege,

ridge

gency

ne of

itions le to-

Nor

ess it

nion, has

origi-

script,

sent;

mme-Iarris,

idies ; ibility

ques-

for the scheme, and to our own University of Cambridge, if we are right in supposing that the printing has been done by them; to each and all of these our thanks are equally due.

'Photography,' Professor Harris truly says, 'is a literary fire insurance of the first importance;' and it is probably only the expensiveness of the process which has hindered a much wider use of it than has hitherto prevailed. But the risks which a library and its manuscripts run were illustrated only too forcibly in the siege of Strasburg by the Germans, and even those libraries where the danger of accident is reduced to a minimum have often to confront the danger attendant upon lending. The reproduction of the unique Laurentian MS. of Sophocles was undertaken, we believe, by our English Palæographical Society, and the Jerusalem Codex is as unique as the Laurentian, with all the added disadvantage of Jerusalem for its home instead of Florence.

But though the ten plates of facsimiles are beyond question the most valuable, the introduction will be to the general reader the most immediately useful portion of the book under review. Professor Harris gives us about a hundred pages of matter, most of which is new, while all is worth reading. In his longest section, that on the secondary authorities for the text, he has with immense diligence added to the already known parallels from Barnabas and Hermas, from the Church Ordinances and the Apostolical Constitutions, a large number from all sorts of writers down to the fifth and sixth centuries. Unfortunately, if not unnaturally, Mr. Harris has a single eye for the new discovery. His mental vision, preoccupied with it, can embrace nothing else, and any passage containing common matter with the Teaching is at once set down as a copy from it. To be consistent he should have added the Evangelists to the imitators of the Teaching; at least it comes to much the same thing if Clement of Alexandria's quotation of the Evangelical precepts, 'Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself,' and 'To him that smiteth thee on the one cheek, offer the other also,' is given as an 'almost certain' reference to the Teaching. In any case Mr. Harris would really seem to think that the latter was more widely used in the second century than the canonical Gospels. Such exaggeration is the more to be regretted as likely to compromise what we may call the serious side of his position. For while we are sure that he has brought forward nothing at all conclusive to show that Justin Martyr and Clement of Alexandria (among others) used the Teaching, on the other hand the parallels with, e.g., some Dionysius, probably the Bishop of Alexandria, and what is more interesting still, with the Epistle of Jude, are not a little striking. Later Latin use of it is conclusively proved by Mr. Harris; but we still think that the early use is mainly Syrian and Alexandrian, and we believe with Dr. Warfield that an Egyptian and a Syrian recension are to be distinguished.

We are touching here on the most complicated of all questions yet remaining to be solved in regard to the Teaching. What is the mutual relation of the Teaching, of the Epistle of Barnabas, of the Church Ordinances? Where direct amplification explains the facts,

VOL. XXVII.-NO. LIII.

as with the Seventh Book of the Apostolical Constitutions compared with Bryennios' MS., the problem is simple. But the relation to the Epistle of Barnabas—it is being universally recognized—is not to be so simply explained. Professor Harris of course agrees with those who reject Harnack's original dogmatic assertion that the Teaching copies Barnabas; but although he contributes valuable matter to the discussion of this and kindred points, it is rather by calling attention to new problems than by solving old ones. For instance, he suggests that the scribe or corrector of the Sinaitic Codex altered the text of Barnabas into greater agreement with the Teaching. The hypothesis in this case seems improbable and the evidence not convincing, but they aptiv illustrate the complexity of the data. As to the Church Ordinances (why on earth does Mr. Harris call them by so misleading a name as the Apostolical Canons?), the point emphasized in this volume is their dependence on Barnabas. But of the four instances quoted in support of this view, three vanish if we take the text of the Ordinances, not from the Vienna but from the Ottobonian MS.—a phenomenon which in conjunction with others is not unworthy of discussion. It is curious, for instance, that, if we have reckoned rightly, there are twenty-nine minor readings where the Ottobonian MS. (sometimes with, sometimes against, the Vienna MS.) agrees with the text of the Constitutions against that of the Teaching, while coincidences of the Ottobonian MS, with the Teaching against the Vienna MS. are numerous, drastic, and all-important.

In conclusion we can only make passing mention of one point where Professor Harris, supplementing and developing the views of some previous editors, seems to us to be substantially in the right. Going beyond Dr. Taylor, who had demonstrated the Jewish origin of the Two Ways, and beyond Dr. Salmon, who had extended the hypothesis of the Jewish original to the chapters on Baptism, Prayer, Fasting, and 'Eucharists,' he sees in the whole work as we have it (with the exception of the purely Christian interpolation in chapter ii.) the réchauffé of a Jewish manual for proselytes, a conclusion which has been already expressed in this Review.1 Mr. Harris supports his position by arguments drawn from the Hebraistic character of the whole; but for these we must be content to refer our readers to the

book itself.

The Scripture Doctrine of the Church, Historically and Exegetically Considered: the Eleventh Series of the Cunningham Lectures. By the Rev. D. Douglas Bannerman, M.A. (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1887.)

We have read Mr. Bannerman's lectures with very great interest. Delivered by a Presbyterian on a Presbyterian foundation, there is of course much that we disagree with, but we prefer to realize how much also there is with which we are able to sympathize. If we shall have to point out the fallacies in his defence of Presbyterianism, we must thank him for his elaborate vindication of the doctrine of a visible Church.

1 Church Quarterly Review for July 1887.

188

obje for

trac The subs tern and who

as e

one esse had selve the ! joy ' in s miss the (trina I

teria

1

by a tiani it wi fact, of th the e Jewis exerc thoug of the the 1 synag pose S

έπίσκ gates drawi wish t that throu them certai It was

have

any e

red

1 to

t to

ose

hing

the

tion

rests

kt of

nesis

but

urch ding this

nces

f the

ny of

oned

onian

grees

while

t the

point

ws of

right.

origin

d the

rayer,

ave it

ter ii.)

which

rts his

of the

to the

etically

es. By

ourgh:

nterest.

here is

ze how

If we

ianism,

rine of

Passing over details we will consider separately the two main objects of the lecture—the doctrine of the Church, and the evidence for Presbyterianism.

Not confining himself to the New Testament, Mr. Bannerman traces the history of the Church from the time of Abraham onwards. The Christian Church was not in itself something new; it was not a substitute for, it was a development of, the Jewish Church. The term ἐκκλησία was not a new one, it was derived from the Septuagint, and was probably (though not certainly) used of the Church, as a whole, before it was used of local churches.

In working out the practical conception of the Christian Church as established by the Apostles, Mr. Bannerman shows how it was one: 'The Hebrew Christian Church was, and felt itself to be, essentially one. It is constantly spoken of as one. It acted and had suitable means for acting as one.' 'They were, and felt themselves to be, one in the Lord, one in the new life of the Holy Spirit, the Spirit of Christ and of God, one in faith and love, in hope and joy' (p. 433; cf. also p. 557 sq.). The unity in doctrine, in worship, in sacraments, in organization, is carefully worked out. What we miss, perhaps, is an insufficient appreciation of the mystical idea of

the Church, as taught by St. Paul, and of the very important doctrinal consequences to be drawn from it.

But we must pass on to Mr. Bannerman's defence of Presbyterianism.

In the first place, he attempts to gain credit for Presbyterianism by asserting that it has a Jewish origin, and is older than Christianity. This is really a very dangerous method of argument, and it will certainly have no weight with any but Presbyterians; all, in fact, it does do, is to explain the historical origin of the $\pi \rho \epsilon \sigma \beta \acute{\nu} \tau \epsilon \rho o a$ of the New Testament; this is something very different. Moreover, the elders of the synagogues were a very subordinate element in Jewish religious life; therefore, we might argue, the elders ought to exercise a subordinate position in the Christian life; and, again, though the synagogues did undoubtedly help to preserve the unity of the body of Jews in any one city, it was not the synagogues but the temple which preserved the unity of the Jewish race. The synagogues with their elders only succeeded in fulfilling their purpose by existing side by side with the temple and the temple system.

Secondly, whatever the organization of the Catholic Church may have been, it certainly was not Presbyterian. Now, we will set aside any evidence there may be against the identity of $\pi \rho \epsilon \sigma \beta \dot{\nu} \tau \epsilon \rho \omega$ and $\dot{\epsilon}\pi i \sigma \kappa \sigma \omega$; we will also set aside the position of the apostolic delegates Timothy and Titus, and any argument which may have been drawn from the $d\gamma \gamma \epsilon \lambda \omega$ of the Apocalypse. We do this because we wish to dwell only on what is certain. Now one thing is certain, and that is the apostolic government of the apostolic churches. It was through the Apostles that the Church was organized; it was from them that the deacons and presbyters received their authority, though certainly in some cases, perhaps in all, elected by the community. It was they, above all, who preserved the unity of the Church. It

was they who, acting, it is true, with the Church as a whole, prevented the disunion of the early Church by the apostolic council at Jerusalem. It was St. Paul who by his letters and personal supervision preserved the unity of the churches he had founded. What would have happened if the presbyterate of Galatia and of Corinth had been allowed to go their own way and had had no supervision and authority above them? Considering how invariably in the Acts of the Apostles the ἀπόστολοι are separate from the πρεσβύτεροιconsidering the importance which St. Paul ascribes to the office of ἀπόστολος—it is as absurd to dwell on the fact that St. Peter or St. John calls himself πρεσβύτερος as it would be on the fact that St. Paul calls himself διάκονος. There were πρεσβύτεροι in the Apostolic Church, but they held an inferior and subordinate position; the Church was not Presbyterian, and if it had been it would not have preserved that unity on which Mr. Bannerman rightly dwellsso fully.

Thirdly, although the actual process of the growth of the Christian ministry in its present form is undoubtedly obscure, what is certain is that Episcopacy existed in Asia Minor in the time of the Apostle John; that at the end of the first century the Christian officers at Rome derived their authority from the Apostles; that Episcopacy was held by Ignatius at the beginning of the second century as essential to a Church, and is known to have been universal shortly after the middle of that century. For our proof we need only refer to Bishop Lightfoot's *Ignatius*. Here we will make two remarks. The connection of Episcopacy with St. John is very much more than a mere 'speculation' (p. 553, note 2); there is just about asgood evidence for it as there is for the four Gospels-that is, the direct evidence of Clement of Alexandria, of Irenæus (based upon Polycarp), of Tertullian, of the Muratorian canon, of Dionysius, of Polycrates—the indirect evidence of the Ignatian letters. secondly, if an appeal is made to Harnack's criticism of Lightfoot in the Expositor, let Mr. Bannerman remember that as an authority Harnack is to him valueless, because he says that we have no evidence for πρεσβύτεροι until the second century in the Christian Church, and that in his arguments he practically draws attention to the similarity of evidence for the Gospels and for Episcopacy-only he does not accept the Gospels.

We reject Presbyterianism because we are quite certain it does not represent the form of government in the Apostolic Church; we accept Episcopacy because we are certain it has existed 'from the Apostles' time' (Preface to Ordinal).

Lastly, may we make one appeal to Mr. Bannerman personally? He, equally with ourselves, has realized the conception of the Church of Christ; he has that desire for unity which is the necessary condition of attaining unity. All must feel that, at any rate from a human point of view, the reunion of Christianity must be very far off; but all can work and hope for it. And we ask him, is it more likely that that desire for unity which the tone of his book and the fairness of his arguments will foster will be more easily fulfilled by a modern.

wer 1,80

198

DR. and a cabeen

the

Heb

full We which these we a combined term Nico of Je

prolo is to disco

lievi

after

time

verificathe adult other amore hardl

Gosp has p and t oct.

ore-

l at

hat nth

ion lcts

e of

ror

that

the

osi-

ould

vells-

stian

rtain

ostle

rs at

pacy

y as-

ortly

refer

arks.

more it as

, the

upon

is, of

And

ot in

ority

ence, and

larity

s not

does

; we

n the

nally?

ondi-

uman ; but

y that

ess of odern.

institution like Presbyterianism, or by 'those three orders' which were recognized by all Christians for 1,500 years, and are still, after 1,800 years, preserved by the majority of Christians?

The Gospel of St. John: an Exposition Exegetical and Homiletical.

For the use of Clergymen, Students, and Teachers. By the
Rev. Thomas Whitelaw, M.A., D.D. (Glasgow: James
Maclehose & Sons, 1888.)

DR. WHITELAW'S commentary on St. John is a result of much honest and laborious work. In the introduction of lxii pages he has made a careful and well-arranged analysis of almost everything which has been written on the subject. He adds no new arguments, but gives the old ones well and ably. He follows Westcott in assigning a Hebrew origin to the term Logos.

The commentary, which fills 460 pages, consists firstly of a very full 'exposition,' and, secondly, of 'homiletics' or points for sermons. We must own that we have very slight affection for aids to preachers which provide a substitute for thought instead of a stimulus, and these analyses of the doctrine of the Gospel will have a tendency, we are afraid, to produce rather dull and heavy discourses. The commentary is as laborious as it is jejune. We give instances of his views on two important passages. On iii. 5 he writes, 'The term water . . . is simply the water of baptism itself, with which Nicodemus was familiar, both in John's baptism and in the baptism of Jewish proselytes' (p. 66). On vi. 56:

'The truth seems to be that the idea here expressed of inward, believing, spiritual fellowship with the crucified and risen Christ was afterwards embodied by our Lord in the Holy Supper, but whether at the time of announcing it He had before His mind the institution of that supper... or whether this was an afterthought, "the product of the hour of the supper itself," cannot be determined (p. 159).

Occasionally, his style is a little curious. 'In the preceding prologue the author has briefly introduced the exalted personage who is to form the subject of his contemplated history' (p. 24). The discourse in chap. vi. is subdivided into 'A solemn reproof,' 'An earnest exhortation,' 'A clear direction,' &c.

The critical notes seem to be given accurately where we have verified them, but the following extracts imply that the writer has rather a confused idea of the subject. On the Woman taken in adultery he writes: 'It occurs . . . in the Syriac, Æthiopic, and other translations.' And then, 'it is absent from thirty versions, amongst these the Peschito and the Nestorian.' Dr. Whitelaw can hardly understand the different Syriac versions.

Dr. Whitelaw does not add anything to the elucidation of the Gospel, and is destitute of any great exegetical insight or skill, but has produced a book which will be very useful to many students, and the writing of which must have been very helpful to himself.

The Ante-Nicene Fathers; Bibliographical Synopsis. By Ernest C. Richardson, M.A. (Buffalo: The Christian Literature Company, 1887.)

WE have here a bibliography of the Ante-Nicene Fathers which, so far as we have been able to test it, is practically exhaustive. Not only are the lists under the heads of Editions, Translations, and Literature immense, but frequent notes are appended which classify the chief authorities for the various views of disputed points. instance, the note at p. 15 upon the Ignatian Epistles. It is quite astonishing to see, in the tremendous catalogue of works upon so recent a discovery as the Didachè (pp. 83-6), what a place early Christianity claims in the world's attention. Mr. Richardson is librarian of Hartford Theological Seminary, and doubtless his position has afforded him facilities for carrying out so laborious a work. But though Dr. Cleveland Coxe in the preface which he prefixes to the work appears to believe that it owes much to the stores of Hartford Library, Mr. Richardson himself explains that one of his chief reasons for believing it to be needed by his countrymen is that there is not a single adequate theological library in America. not how far the stores even of European collections would meet the demands of so omnivorous a scholar. But even if we have better libraries at hand we cannot perceive that the fact renders us more independent of such an invaluable help as that which Mr. Richardson has provided. It must be regarded as indispensable to all who intend to study any department of the field of early Christian literature. The very copious index drawn up by Dr. Pick to the American translations of The Ante-Nicene Fathers is only useful to those who possess that edition. It would be worth Mr. Clarke's while to adapt it to his English series.

Proteus: a Layman's Reply to Sir James Stephen on Mr. Mivart's Modern Catholicism. By THOMAS MAGUIRE, F.T.C.D. (Dublin, 1888)

This is but a pamphlet of a dozen pages, but those who are aware of the author's metaphysical reputation will read with interest the rejoinder of so able a Roman Catholic to the rude attack of Sir James. Stephen upon the Roman Church. The reply comes to this: that the learned judge writes as a materialist, and that not only all religion but all philosophy is against materialism. Even materialists themselves are forced to believe in something behind matter, and when you allow this something behind matter it confounds all calculations, however confident, which are made on the supposition that there is nothing behind matter. And Professor Maguire appears to regard the Church as the representative of that eternal something which underlies phenomenal existence. In fact we might suggest a motto from Rabelais: 'As the great vaticinator Proteus could not presage anything till he was restored to his proper and kindly form, so man cannot receive the divine gift of prophecy unless the part within him. which is divine—the vovs or mind—is calm, peaceable, untroubled, quiet, still, and not distracted with foreign passions and affections.

we. exor laws to I says laws dest use not Prof Chu tanta cien with an e he d scho belie the o the Cath elem ence ceas belie But. tion can to be find a Cl such men disco is th find lieve Real belie Mag good majo

1888

The

strol

do r

that

whic

is re

supp

r C. omo far only erathe For uite 1 50 early n is oosiork. es to Iartchief here now the etter nore dson tend The ansssess o his arts blin, re of e reames. t the but elves you howre is vhich notto esage man

him.

bled,

Oct.

The Professor undoubtedly deals the materialists some awkward strokes. For instance, he quotes Mr. Morley as laying down that 'we can only know ourselves as part of the stupendous and inexorable succession of phenomenal conditions, moving according to laws that may be formulated positively, but not interpreted morally, to new destinies that are eternally unfathomable.' 'The reply,' says Professor Maguire, 'is, if all is phenomena there can be no laws; and if there be laws then all is not phenomena. And "new destinies" look very like old final causes. And how can a positivist use the word eternal in any sense whatever?' This, we must say, is not only neat but thoroughly true. But when we come to consider Professor Maguire's principle in its reference to the claims of his Church, we are much perplexed thereabout. The Professor has a tantalizing method of just hinting at some great truth as sufficient to cover all his adversaries with shame, and leaving us to face without any assistance the difficulties which meet us in applying it. As an example of the freedom of Roman Catholics in all physical inquiries. he denies that the doctrine of transubstantiation binds them to the scholastic distinction of substance and accident. They are bound to believe that 'after consecration a change takes place objectively in the elements, though that change is not apparent to the senses, or to the more searching apparatus of physical science. Every Roman Catholic of intelligence would avow that to a Parsee chemist the elements both before and after consecration would present no difference. But if the Roman Catholic denied all difference he would cease to be a Roman Catholic; that there is a difference he must believe, but how that difference arises he is not called on to explain.' But Professor Maguire does not explain why the word transubstantiation is used in the Roman definition, or what the meaning of the term can be, if the scholastic distinction of substance and accidents is not to be insisted on. And when he says that the Parsee chemist would find no difference before and after consecration, does he mean that a Christian chemist, were he even a chemist-Pope, could find any such difference? And if no such difference in the matter of the elements can be discovered by man, while at the same time the qualities discoverable by man include all that man can know of matter, what is this objective change of which he speaks, and how did anybody find it out? It would seem to us that what Professor Maguire believes in is not a change objectively in the elements, but an objective Real Presence without any change in the elements; which is the belief, not of the Roman Church, but of the Anglican. Professor Maguire believes that cases like that of Sir James Stephen demonstrate the necessity of a teaching Church, unless sheer materialism be good for man; for the basis of religion is philosophy, and the majority of educated men are utterly incapable of philosophy. We do not agree that philosophy is the basis of religion, but we admit that its true basis lies in those capacities of universal human nature which philosophy expounds. It is quite true that a teaching Church is required in order to keep before human nature the Religion which supplies their wants. But if mankind in general be incapable of that exercise of mind which is the basis of religion, by what means does Professor Maguire propose that the teaching Church shall get a hold of them; and what good will it do them to be compelled or induced by the Church to profess a religion the basis of which they are incapable of taking in?

Westminster and other Sermons. By RICHARD CHENEVIX TRENCH, D.D., Archbishop. (London: Kegan Paul, Trench, & Co., 1888.)

This volume contains a selection of twenty-five sermons from two volumes published by Archbishop Trench in his lifetime, both of which are now out of print. The title-page illustrates in a curious way some remarks which we have elsewhere made upon the desire with which the Archbishop's literary representatives seem consumed of suppressing all remembrance of his connexion with Ireland; for while the two volumes in question were entitled Sermons preached in Westminster Abbey and Sermons preached for the most part in Ireland, Westminster is the only local designation which appears in the present volume, and the name of the obnoxious island is veiled under the description 'other.' This may be accident, but it certainly results in a title which would naturally mean that one of the sermons is called 'Westminster.' But it is not accidental that the author should be described here, as well as on the title-page of the Memorials, simply as 'Archbishop,' without any local designation. This is obviously wrong. It is to perpetuate the anomalous condition in which the Archbishop was placed after he had resigned his see and his title had become merely one of courtesy. We say of course, colloquially, Archbishop Trench and Bishop Jeremy Taylor. But who ever saw outside the Calendar the formal designation 'Jeremy Taylor, Bishop'? Yet 'bishop' denotes the indelible order which remains after the connexion with a special sphere of jurisdiction has been dissolved, while nobody can be archbishop except in relation to a particular province. We find in Martinus Scriblerus the question argued whether it is possible to form an abstract idea of a Lord Mayor. It is equally hard to form an abstract idea of an Archbishop. As if some general, having once filled the post of commander-in-chief in India, were ever afterwards to be designated as commander-in-chief, without saying where the function had been exercised! For the sermons themselves, they are worthy of their admirable author. They do not, indeed, treat of those primary questions of all theology with which the teachers of the present time are forced to grapple; nor do they, for the most part, concern themselves with those doctrinal subjects so hotly debated, both in England and Ireland, at the time when they were preached. Remembering the condition of the Church at that time, we might almost wonder that there is so little in the volume which exhibits its author as a combatant in the fight. But it is best that he should have preached as his inspirations led him. His readers will find here, as everywhere in his works, the deepest sense of the beauty of divine truth, a loving quickness to observe the spiritual applications of Bible story, an unfailing moral earnestness, which could only

com lastl sent all t mig

18881

The

THE his a in a prob pict feeli that six c in S inim neve East men life Righ trues the 1 have I spite

poss will a litt inter that 'can mark men who bette vain. Chui almo estab faced he li tinua he pl away

read

does

hold

iny are

NCH,

two

h of ious

esire

med ; for

ed in

and,

the eiled

certhe

t the

tion.

ition

see urse,

But

remy

hich ction

t in

lerus

tract

tract

filled

vards e the

they

at of

rs of

most

hotly

were

time, hich

at he will

eauty

olicaonly

3.)

come from the experience of a true pastor and a true man, and, lastly, an exquisite literary skill both in the expression of each sentence and the proportion of the whole. As a worthy specimen of all these merits, as well as for its unusually doctrinal character, we might perhaps select Sermon X.—'Christ the Lamb of God.'

The Blessedness of the Dead in Christ, and other Sermons. By the late WILLIAM MATURIN, D.D., Perpetual Curate of All Saints, Grangegorman, Dublin. (London and New York: Macmillan & Co., 1888.)

THE English reader will find these sermons very well worthy of his attention. They display a firm grasp of Church principles, not in any narrow conception, but in their connexion with the great problems of moral life: a peculiar power in realising and elaborating pictures of human character and history, and great depth of natural feeling rigidly kept in restraint. The six first discourses are upon that subject of universal interest which gives the title to the volume; six others contain a complete and excellent exposition of the parables in St. Luke xv. The name of Rizpah calls up a Scripture scene of inimitable pathos which has been expounded by many a preacher, never, we think, with greater beauty and feeling than here. The Easter sermon and that upon Justification are well-reasoned statements of doctrine, and 'Glorying in the Cross' exhibits with glowing life the practical effect of Christian belief. That on 'Women's Rights' displays formidable powers of sarcasm side by side with the truest appreciation of woman's work in its genuine place. Nor will the rest of the volume be found in any way below the sermons we have named.

But to many in Ireland the volume will offer a charm which, in spite of its many merits both literary and theological, it cannot possess for those who did not know the author. They, as they read, will supply the well-remembered voice and delivery, the earnest face, a little stern, the firm decided voice, the restrained action, the deep intensity, which made all feel that behind every thought and emotion that was expressed there lay a store of belief and affection which 'cannot be uttered.' William Maturin was in truth a man of great mark, though his sphere was comparatively small, and his advancement in the Church so poor as to do little credit to the Church rulers, who neglected his claims until, when Archbishop Trench offered better preferment, he was too old to move. But he did not live in Through fully half a century he held up the standard of Church principles, and for the larger part of this period he stood almost alone among the Dublin clergy. The stormy times of Disestablishment and Revision brought him special difficulties, which he faced and overcame by the sheer force of character and conviction. And he lived to see opposition die down and provision made for the continuance of his parish work upon the same lines as those on which he placed it. It would have been a pity that such a man should pass away and leave no memorial of his mental powers. And those who read the sermons without previous knowledge of their author may

take from us the assurance, never without interest for the reader of any such work, that his life and death were as unworldly and as Christian as the precepts which he preached.

Christopher Wordsworth, Bishop of Lincoln, 1807–1885. By John Henry Overton, Canon of Lincoln and Rector of Epworth, and Elizabeth Wordsworth, Principal of Lady Margaret Hall, Oxford. (London: Rivingtons, 1888.)

A BIOGRAPHY like this one can be fairly judged only by recollecting the character of its subject and the end which the writers have had in view. The late Bishop of Lincoln was not wont, except indirectly, to reveal the innermost springs of thought and action. The reserve which distinguishes all really strong religious life distinguished his, though its light shone before men. There was no marked crisis in a career thoroughly sound from boyhood and unbroken in its continuity. In the history of convictions thought out and substantially formed in early manhood there is little to record except a calm development. One who was so indifferent to earthly distinction did not pursue any social advantages, though using them when given for the welfare of the Church. It is vain, therefore, to expect to meet in this volume with events and personal experiences of the same engrossing kind as are found e.g. in the Lives of men like Bishop S. Wilberforce, Bishop Patteson, or Frederick Maurice. The writers have been wisely content to illustrate from various points of view the life and work of the bishop as determined by his character. Their design is brought out in the following passage, which admirably summarises the main lesson conveyed by the whole memoir.

'It may well be believed that such a personality as his had a special and important work to perform for the age in which he lived, and seemed intended to afford an illustration of what strong religious faith could do. If such a phrase may be used, it emphasized in a most remarkable way the a posteriori evidence for Christianity. It displayed to the world a character of rare beauty, strength, simplicity, and lovableness, and it gave that character a power of acting on others which had in it something perfectly distinct from the effect produced on us by mere ability, learning, talent, kindliness, and the like. It brought men into the presence of one who lived in a constant sense of the presence of God, and whose very countenance and manner bore the tokens of it. His character, as a whole, was the first and the last thing that one thought of in being with him. The result of life and education had been, in his case, not to produce some one who knew a great deal, nor even who did a great deal, but who was many-sided, earnest, far-seeing, deepfeeling, and noble, a man with an unusually strong sense of proportion, and for that reason one with whom the paramount idea was the thought of Eternity' (p. 516).

In a former number of the *Church Quarterly Review* (April 1885, Art. viii.) a sketch of Bishop Wordsworth's episcopate was given, which is now illustrated in detail by his biography. This obviates the necessity for any lengthened notice of the present work, which, as we learn from the preface, 'has not been intended to supersede, but to supplement that which the bishop has himself left

behi mair see 1 tious and The which was any work sket elde: with the e table read the l selve

show

harm

1888

feeli pictu Trin Colle dutif piety strati amor of fu religi of ch mins 'per home to b and, wife, him' the ' the g Arch toget those book the g

intere

would

quest

behind him in his various publications.' The volume is, of course, mainly occupied with his episcopate and its results, but we are glad to see that Dr. Wordsworth's headmastership at Harrow, his conscientious administration of the country parish of Stanford-in-the-Vale, and his work as Canon of Westminster have been carefully described. The actual founding of St. John's House and nursing sisterhood, in which Dr. Wordsworth and his friends took a large and active share, was due to Dr. Todd, a fact which will, doubtless, be mentioned in any further edition of this memoir. We are not sure whether the work, as a whole, would not have been more satisfactory if a concise sketch of the bishop's life from birth to death had been given by his eldest daughter, while the chapters on Convocation, the intercourse with foreign Churches, literary work, and some portions of those on the episcopate might have formed a supplement. The chronological table prefixed to the biography will, however, enable a large circle of readers, who either personally or by reputation knew something of the bishop's life, to mark the salient points of his career for them-

The biography has, we think, a special interest and value in showing how carefully from early manhood to old age the bishop harmonized the claims of public and private duty, with which neither feelings nor interests of other kinds were allowed to interfere. The picture of his early life at Winchester, in his home at Buxted and Trinity Lodge, and, afterwards, during his academic career at Trinity College is attractive because of its straightforward and affectionate dutifulness, while it proves the existence of solid though reserved piety stronger in its influence, perhaps, than much of the demonstrative religious feeling of the present day. It is interesting to trace among the extracts given from the boyish journal the earliest glimpses of future work and matured devotion, and that 'strong sense of family religion which is the best possible preparation for the highest kinds of churchmanship' (p. 70). In later years, alike at Stanford, Westminster, and Lincoln, the biography offers abundant evidence of the 'perfect confidence' which always characterized the tranquil life of the home-circle (pp. 327-33). The bishop 'always expected' his children 'to be interested in the things he was interested in himself' (p. 489), and, in the daily course of the household, the influence 'of the devoted wife, who was never far distant, and who was so completely one with him' (p. 506), is described with singular grace and fidelity. To many, the 'personal reminiscences' in the concluding chapter, which include the graphic recollections of the bishop's old friends, the present Archbishop of Canterbury and the late Dean Burgon (pp. 519-26), together with some kindly letters from the bishop himself, such as those on pp. 326, 327, will prove the most attractive parts of the book. They show how truly human in all the relationships of life the great ecclesiastic, scholar, and saint continued to be.

In view of recent discussions, many of our readers will turn with interest to the present biography to ascertain what line of action would have been adopted by the bishop with regard to the anxious question of the relation and duty of the English Church towards the

orth, garet eting

Oct.

er of

had ctly, erve his, in a concially calm did n for meet same

shop riters

rably

becial emed do. way orld a md it some-

somebility, e pre-God, His ought been, e even deeportion, ought

(April e was This work, ed to lf left

'Old Catholics.' We are of opinion that, with all his well-known hostility to the papacy, Dr. Wordsworth would not have advanced a step beyond the principles enunciated in the paragraph drafted by him in the report of the Lambeth Conference of 1878, which referred to the attitude of the Church of England towards foreign churches:

'We gladly welcome any effort for reform upon the model of the Primitive Church. We do not demand a rigid uniformity; we deprecate needless divisions; but to those who are drawn to us in the endeavour to free themselves from the yoke of error and superstition we are ready to offer all help, and such privileges as may be acceptable to them and are consistent with the maintenance of our own principles, as enunciated in our formularies' (p. 381).

A reference to the complete text of the Latin address delivered at the Cologne Congress in 1872 confirms this opinion. After reminding his audience that 'the heretical pravity of the Arian bishops was execrated by the orthodox Church, but she did not deny that they were bishops,' Dr. Wordsworth proceeded, 'Schisma vos patimini. Sed schisma ne facitote. Episcopos novos creare et constituere ne properate. Diœceses, aliis Episcopis jam assignatas, ne temerè invadatis.' It is true that this strong language is somewhat modified in the English translation, 'Do not be in a hurry to consecrate new diocesan bishops,' but, in an accompanying note, the speaker invited the attention of the 'Old Catholics' to the history of the Meletian schism at Antioch in the fourth century, as showing the disastrous consequences that may arise, and long continue, from setting up a rival episcopate, even with good intentions' (Bishop Wordsworth's Miscellanies, Literary and Religious, vol. i. pp. 465, 469). It can hardly be supposed that, whatever the bishop may have felt as to the consecration of Bishops Reinkens and Herzog, he would have consented to proposals—happily avoided by the Lambeth Conference of 1888 as well as by that of 1878—the adoption of which would have involved the Anglican Communion in unforeseen, and perhaps disastrous, difficulties and confusion,

The narrative of the bishop's closing days and the record of his last words, 'novissima verba,' preserved with filial piety by the Bishop of Salisbury in his memorial sermon, Love and Discipline, from which an extract is given (pp. 527-532), will touch and console many hearts. During the last five sorrowful months of life, his work for the Church was not intermitted. When 'the hand of death was already upon him' (p. 459)—and 'in losing his wife he had lost the sheet-anchor of his life' (p. 475)—he wrote, 'as a legacy for his grandchildren,' a little volume entitled, How to Read the Old Testament. That book is justly described as 'a brief, but very thorough, though simple sketch of the spiritual or mystical interpretation of the Old Testament, a subject which would keep the intellectual powers of a scholar in the prime of life and vigour at their fullest strain' (p. 459). No one can close this biography without being deeply impressed by the 'singleness of eye' which, in the language of Bishop King (p. 533), characterized Christopher Wordsworth, and with the dignity and proportion of a devoted life full of good works which will long endure. The dral, executed general been one

THI

1888

lectu a m adva trac cour suffi enal tion have Oxfo and anol by t both othe Eng

Men MR. calc write poss ledg publ stroi asso fami strai strai trait in a publ brill idol beer

anin

son'

cert

nown

ed a

d by

erred

nes:

ecate

avour

dy to

d are

ted in

vered

er re-

shops

that

mini.

e pro-

datis.'

n the

cesan

l the

letian

strous

up a

orth's

t can

con-

ice of

have

rhaps

of his

ishop

which

earts.

hurch

upon

hor of

en,' a

book

imple

Γesta-

cholar No

y the 533),

y and

dure.

The beautiful monument which has been erected in Lincoln Cathedral, not far from the site of St. Hugh's shrine, will, by its fidelity of execution and the appropriateness of its symbolism, suggest to future generations the main features of the bishop's life and work, as they have been happily represented in this instructive and edifying biography.

One Body: the Story of the Church of England. By the Rev. J. R. TURNOCK, M.A., Hon. Canon of Norwich, Vicar of St. Mary at the Tower, Ipswich. (London: Wells Gardner, Darton, & Co., 1888.)

THIS painstaking and readable little volume is a reprint of eight lectures delivered in the church of St. Mary at the Tower, Ipswich, a method of instruction in Church history which might with great advantage be imitated elsewhere. The writer has been careful to trace the various channels through which Christianity came to our country, though the results of the mission of St. Augustine are not sufficiently emphasized, while an additional lecture would have enabled general readers to distinguish with greater clearness the position of the 'British Church' and the work of the Celtic Mission, and have brought into greater prominence the figure of St. Aidan. Oxford Movement and its results, especially the growth of the Colonial and Missionary Church, should have had a lecture to itself. Should another edition of the work be called for, its value would be increased by these additions. Meantime, we can recommend it to the notice both of clergy and intelligent laity, who are able by lectures or in other ways to spread accurate information about the history of the English Church.

Memoir of George Edmund Street, R.A. By his Son, Arthur Edmund Street. (London: J. Murray, 1888.)

MR. ARTHUR E. STREET'S memoir of his distinguished father is not calculated to alter the general verdict that no one is so ill-qualified to write his father's biography as his own son. No one, it is true, possesses such intimate knowledge of him, but much of that knowledge is not of a kind that it would be becoming for a child to The best of men have their foibles, the publish to the world. strongest characters have their weaknesses, and to these those who associate with them day by day in the undisguised intercourse of family life, unless unreasoning affection blinds their eyes, cannot be strangers. But the very nearness of the connection imposes a restraint with regard to the very features essential to a truthful portrait. All the world cried shame on the late Rector of Lincoln when in an autobiography, which certainly ought never to have been published, he exposed the foibles of his father and smirched the brilliancy with which popular belief had invested his sister, the idolized 'Sister Dora' of Walsall. Mr. Arthur Street would have been pronounced equally wanting in filial piety if any unfavourable animadversions on a father who, if ever a father did, deserved his son's most reverential affection, found place in his pages. It was certainly not his province to register his father's failings and admit

the world to his confidence. No one could ask it of him. But the result is, as it ever must be, that we possess a very partial likeness of the man, and we should have preferred an impartial likeness. is there who would not prefer a Cromwell with all his warts to an Elizabeth without her wrinkles? And the worst of it is that a biography which, like the one before us, is all panegyric, even though not destined for publication, and originally intended, as Mr. A. Street tells us, to be no more than a private record, provokes unjust depreciation, and the attempt to elevate a character, in many respects so truly admirable, to a pinnacle above common attainment provokes in some a malicious desire to drag it down below its proper level. Those who unfortunately had other experiences of Mr. Street will smile when they read that, as far as his son can remember, his father 'never spoke a harsh word,' and that he habitually 'exercised a great command over the expression of his feelings,' even though this description is qualified by the statement that 'his weapon, when he had to draw it, was the good broadsword of honest outspokenness, and not the rapier of innuendo,' of which indeed he was incapable. 'Straightforward, sincere, and charitable,' it is true he was, and, as his son writes, with 'the merits and demerits of a typical Englishman.' Though deeply wounded if another man's work was preferred to his, few men were ever more free from mean jealousy of his brother-architects, with whom, his son records, and we believe truly, his 'relations were always kindly and cordial,' and for the works of many of whom he had 'hearty admiration.' He also gladly recognized the merits of the young and rising members of his profession with whom he was brought in contact at the Institute of British Architects, in whom he perceived evidence of real ability, 'seeking them out diligently, and giving them what prominence he was able. But to these attractive qualities was united a highly-strung susceptibility, which rendered him sensitive of every slight and made him wince under adverse criticism. Though never consciously 'placing himself on the pedestal of infallibility,' and as free from any offensive manifestation of self-conceit as any man could be, his self-reliance not unfrequently betrayed him into a dictatorial attitude and a somewhat petulant impatience of animadversion. Ready, as his son tells us he was, to 'criticize the products of his own imagination' most severely, and amend them if he found them faulty, when once they had passed that self-constituted ordeal he did not take the criticism of others kindly. If he had satisfied himself that he could not better the work, it did not please him that any one else should be of a different opinion. It is not surprising that, as his son tells us, 'those who put themselves into his hands as clients'-why not 'employers'? 'client,' now so fashionable, implies a subordinate position hardly in keeping with the true relation of the parties—'were generally content to do so with little restriction,' and 'generally found him inflexible' when they suggested alterations of his plans. It is true that his 'obvious self-reliance and strength of character begot a corresponding feeling of security in those for whom he worked, which '-such is the infectious power of unswerving belief in one's self-'often became

mor fron susc in th on i occa bein typi he r wou was 'his grea imp his: reop his on mar inst 'as abs tho Mr. whi pass inte ano fath wor his ' M we take jud con and

> WOI Go

> if l rail

> ove catl up

> chu sev

'ab

1888

enth

his i

t the Who o an bionot tells eciatruly es in evel. will cised ough when kencapwas, pical preof his truly, vorks y ression ritish eking able. ceptihim acing nsive iance ometells most they icism better of a those ers'? dly in ntent xible' 'obnding

is the

came

Oct.

enthusiasm.' But it does not necessarily follow that this conviction of his infallibility was always well grounded, or that if he had thought it more possible that he could err, and had been more open to counsel from others, he might not sometimes have produced better work. The susceptibility of Mr. Street's nature appears painfully in the references in the Memoir to affronts, as he regarded them, passed upon him on the inauguration of some of his architectural works. On these occasions he was always pulled two ways; his 'natural horror at being made much of in his own person,' belonging to him as 'a typical Englishman,' being 'difficult to reconcile with the importance he rightly attached to his official position as architect of the building the completion of which was being celebrated.' 'He would and he would not.' He shrank from the recognition, and yet fretted if it was not accorded. At the annual gathering at East Grinstead, when 'his great work there was drawing to a close,' he writes, 'We found a great mob of people, among whom the shy architect seemed the least important;' and failing to secure his proper recognition, he 'effected his retreat from the tent before the speeches began.' Again, at the reopening of Bristol Cathedral—the nave of which is certainly one of his most successful, if not the most successful of his works-when, on going to Canon Girdlestone's to lunch, he found 'every one marshalled in before him,' he 'took the opportunity to slip away instead of going into the dining-room.' 'It suited me,' he writes, 'as I was rather in a hurry for time; and really it does seem rather absurd that all the young parsons and elderly aldermen should be thought of first, and the architect left to himself on such an occasion.' Mr. Arthur Street has done little service to his father's memory, which is so deservedly dear to him, by giving to the world these passing ebullitions of a wounded self-appreciation, which were only intended for the eye of a member of his family circle. To turn to another point, the writer of the Memoir has done a wrong to his father in bringing forward so prominently, as if it were a merit worthy of imitation, the railroad rapidity with which he got through his work. In Mr. Street himself the old adage was too often verified, 'Most haste, worst speed,' his works being often distinctly, and, we may add, necessarily, inferior to what he was capable of, if he had taken more time about them, while his example may prove very prejudicial to younger men who, with less than a tithe of his genius and consummate practical ability, attempt to rival his speed of production, and end in ill-considered, slovenly work. Good as much of Street's work is, it too often furnishes something to be regretted, which recalls Goldsmith's critical dictum, that 'the artist would have done better if he had taken more pains.' Mr. A. Street's record of incessant railway journeys-usually employed in trying to keep abreast of his overwhelming correspondence—with inspections of churches and cathedrals, rapid measurements and sketchings, and as rapid drawing up of plans and specifications-such as two railway journeys, a whole church measured, plotted to scale, and new parts designed in about seven hours and a half; and again, the American Church in Paris, 'about the most costly church he had ever had to build,' designed and drawn to scale within an hour or so of his first visit to the site, these and other almost equally marvellous tours de force—fairly take away one's breath and render it no matter of surprise that after the warning of too little heeded headache, paralysis, the nemesis of overstrained brain power, should have put a final stop to his busy and successful career at the comparatively early age of fifty-seven, just a twelve-month before the formal opening by the Queen of the most important, though not, we think, the happiest of his architectural works, the New Law Courts, to the perfection of which in every detail, all, down to the woodwork and ironwork, thought out by himself and drawn conscientiously by his own hand, he had devoted such unremitting attention, with which, whatever the verdict posterity may pass upon them, the name of Street will be as inseparably connected as those of Wren with St. Paul's, of Chambers with Somerset House, and of

Soane with the Bank of England.

We have spoken freely of some of the patent faults of the Memoir; we are glad to pass to a more welcome subject, its merits. We have to thank Mr. Arthur Street for the picture he has given us of the noble life of one who was not merely a distinguished architect, but a great and good man-a power distinctly 'making for righteousness,' truly described by his son as one who, 'wherever he bestowed his friendship, exerted by his steadfastness and rightmindedness a real and appreciable moral influence, of whose power none who were thrown much against him could help feeling sensible.' If the unbroken panegyric of the book has led us reluctantly to dwell upon some of the weaknesses of Mr. Street's character, we are not slow to recognize its general beauty and strength, which, while he commanded the admiration and esteem of all brought closely into contact with him, and the enthusiastic affection of those whom he honoured with his friendship, made him also the object of the sincere respect and regard of those connected with him in a lower station, who recognized, as workmen are not slow to do, the thoroughness of his knowledge of his work, and because he was 'never unjustly severe or foolishly lenient,' welcomed his 'strict and equal justice with more real satisfaction than they would have welcomed a weaker and less consistent course.' is hardly necessary to inform our readers that Mr. Street's whole life was spent under the abiding sense of religion, and that before all things and above all things he was an earnest and devout Churchman. His art he chiefly valued as a handmaid to devotion, and regarding the powers of the possession of which he was conscious as a trust placed in his hands by God, he rejoiced to consecrate them to the glory of the Giver. 'The very first work which came into his hands, when as yet he was quite uncertain whether a second was ever to follow, as a true son of the Church, he resolved to give to her as a free-will offering.' The Church's rule was made as far as possible the rule of his life. To attend (with his wife) the early Saint's Day celebrations at All Saints, Margaret Street, of which, at Mr. Richards's request, he held the churchwardenship for many years, was a rule never departed from. On arriving in London at halfpast seven on Sunday morning, after a very cold journey from Dublin involvipolish, chief cown coutlyin tifully time for person and d church for his and hethere.

It

1888

Memoi of Lin led to lament moving chrono was en Law C success 'battle with th ings wl though double power It may had co he wou is a rul good it serious publica at the his con tecture

The L

MR. For so much and get tensive and whethat he

VOL

hese

away ning

ined

essful

elve-

tant,

, the lown

rawn

tting

upon hose

d of

the

erits.

en us

itect,

eous-

owed

real were

un-

upon

ow to

nded

with h his

egard

d, as of his

ient,'

than

e life

e all

ırch-

and us as

them

o his

was

o her

pos-

aint's

Mr.

rears,

half-

ublin

involving a nearly five-hours' crossing, he gives himself 'a very mild polish,' and is in his place at church at eight o'clock. When 'the chief object ' of his life had been accomplished in the erection at his own cost, as a memorial to the wife of his youth, of a church for the outlying district in which his own house had been built-(he beautifully writes, 'I have had such a happy, prosperous life that it is time for me to say Quid retribuam Domino?')-he showed in his person how it should be used: his 'devout example, his reverence and devotion, bearing fruit in the heartiness and orderliness of the churchgoers.' 'Amid all the satisfactions of the place he had chosen for his home, this church, the memorial of his griefs, was the greatest, and he rarely failed to take advantage of the week-day service when The establishment of week-day services was one of the aims of his life, and he was happy in having been able to carry out his wish so near his own doors.

It only remains for us to say that ample justice is done in the Memoir to the part taken in shaping his career by the present Dean of Lincoln, by whose advice he settled at Wantage in 1850, which led to his becoming architect for the diocese of Oxford, and by our lamented friend the Rev. Benjamin Webb, who recommended his moving to London in 1855, and that a full account is given, in chronological order, of the numerous great competitions in which he was engaged-Lille, Constantinople, the National Gallery, the New Law Courts (the last of the series, and the only one in which he was successful, but which he never saw completed), with the wearisome 'battle of the sites,' which it was needless to resuscitate-together with the chief works of new building and of restorations of old buildings which came from his hand, of which lists are appended which, though not pretending to exhaustiveness, fill ten closely-printed double-column pages :- a sufficient testimony to the fertility of his power of production and the marvellous rapidity of his execution. It may be questioned whether, if he had been content to do less, and had concentrated his confessedly remarkable powers on fewer objects, he would not have left a greater name to posterity. Ne multa sed multum is a rule which cannot be safely neglected. The volume has a fairly good index, chiefly topographical, but it wants a table of contents—a serious defect. Its permanent value is much increased by the republication in the Appendix of Mr. Street's six Lectures to the students at the Royal Academy as Professor of Architecture, which proclaim his complete mastery of the science of mediæval ecclesiastical architecture.

The Life of the Right Hon. W. E. Forster, M.P. By T. WEMYSS REID. (London: Chapman and Hall, 1888).

Mr. Forster occupied so prominent a place for some time, and was so much respected by men of all classes for his nobility of character and generosity of purpose, that the memorial of his life will be extensively read. Mr. Reid has evidently the pen of a ready writer; and whilst his narrative is interesting and his style attractive, we regret that he has not confined himself to somewhat narrower limits, and VOL. XXVII.—NO. LIII.

shown himself somewhat less of a universal admirer. Both at the beginning and close of the volumes it seems to have been forgotten that there is much which interests the members of a man's own family which it is unnecessary to place before the general reader by whom these volumes will be studied. Mr. Forster was born in 1818. His father was an indefatigable and enthusiastic preacher amongst the Quakers. His mother, sister of the first Sir Thomas Fowell Buxton, was also a frequent preacher in the same sect. Young Forster followed earnestly the bent naturally given by such parents, and seems to have been prematurely given and disposed to take part in the political and philanthropic contests of the day. Of his youth his biographer seems to think it impossible to speak in too flowing terms. He tells us: 'The whole picture of the youth during those days at school is that of an eminently healthy and noble soulgenerous, sensitive, bright, and sympathetic, absolutely free from the small meannesses which are at times to be found in the dispositions even of schoolboys.' When his vocation for life had to be chosen his father resolved that he should follow some trade, as being more lucrative than the profession of a barrister, which the son desired, the father urging 'the many difficulties which attended the path of a young barrister, the fewness of the prizes of the profession, and the long period which must be endured in almost every case before even a modest competency can be earned; 'thus strangely opposing, for his son, the pursuit of a self-sacrificing disposition of his life, possibly because he had felt the strain in his own case, which, without the supports provided by the Church, we can readily believe to have been excessive. For a time Mr. Forster was engaged with a manufacturer at Norwich; thence he was transferred to Darlington, and afterwards to an office in London, and at the three places learned all that was needed for the successful carrying on of the manufacture of merinos at Bradford, where he was joined in partnership by Mr. Fison. He took the greatest interest in the moral and physical welfare of the hands in his mills, and was ever ready to assist in philanthropic works. At the same time he took an active part in politics as an advanced Radical for those days. He was the eager advocate of universal suffrage; but his views on this subject became afterwards considerably modified. In 1850 he married a daughter of Dr. Arnold, and for marrying out of his own sect he was expelled from the Society of Quakers. His great energy and strong good sense commanded the respect of his neighbours, and he occupied a position of considerable influence, not only in his own party, but in the country. After one or two unsuccessful attempts to get into Parliament as member for Leeds, he was elected in 1861 for Bradford. He at that time was an ardent champion for a national system of education, contending that the voluntary system had been a complete failure in its endeavour to meet the educational wants of the country (i. 311). In this we think he did scant justice to efforts which had effected much during the comparatively short time that it had been encouraged by a small amount of State help; and we doubt whether the work could not have been much better done in every 1888 way

the syste of p aggra was clain with auth Privy the (Gove held him tively the o resig Mr. and s the r which ough Bill v befor get t previ anyth

destriction destri

(i. 46

for a

to fee teach memore remai Gover specia Cowp at the gotten own ler by 1818. nongst Fowell Young arents, e part youth lowing those soulom the sitions chosen g more esired, th of a nd the e even ng, for is life, without to have manuon, and ned all cture of by Mr. physical ssist in part in e eager became ghter of expelled ig good upied a , but in get into radford. stem of omplete country

nich had

ad been

e doubt

in every

way by a more liberal amount of State assistance and volunteers, on the principle which prevailed before 1870, than it has been by the system that was then introduced. When Mr. Lowe proposed his scheme of payment by results, in 1862, Mr. Forster 'believed that it would aggravate rather than remove the existing evils. His chief opposition was to the mechanical grouping of children by age in deciding their claim to the capitation fee; and greatly through his co-operation with Mr. Walpole the scheme was modified, to the disgust of its author, who thereupon resigned his office as Vice-President of the Privy Council. In 1865 he was for a short time Under-Secretary for the Colonies, and had to deal with the outbreak in Jamaica under Governor Eyre. The uncompromising views which he had always held and keenly enforced on the subject of slavery naturally biassed him against the Governor; but he cordially assented to the comparatively moderate proposals of his chief, which were far from satisfying the extreme men of his party. In the following year his party resigned office, but towards the close of 1868 regained power, when Mr. Forster became Vice-President of the Education Department, and shortly undertook the most important work of his life. the recess of 1869 he placed before the Cabinet a memorandum, in which he sketched the lines on which he thought an Education Bill ought to be drawn. Substantially, his proposals were adopted in the Bill which he introduced in the following year. The aim he placed before himself was (1) to cover the country with good schools; (2) to get the parents to send their children to school (i. 464). He had previously announced, in 1869, that he was 'resolved not to destroy anything in the existing system that was good, if he could avoid it' (i. 461). This had angered his Radical friends, who chiefly cared for an Education Bill because they hoped it would injure, if not destroy, the influence of the Church upon the education of the country. As the biographer says-

'To a section of the Liberal Nonconformists it seemed that the schools established under the Minutes of Council by the clergy were a violation of those principles to which they clung so stoutly, and their hope was that any scheme of national education would either transfer the Church and other denominational schools to the control of the ratepayers, or leave them to be carried on without any assistance whatever from the State' (i. 460).

For not falling in with this view Mr. Forster had to encounter the bitter hostility of men of his own party; and in fact they never forgave him. With regard to the religious teaching to be given in the schools he felt as a man of a devout and religious mind, who had been brought up as a Quaker, and who was unbaptized, might be expected to feel. He thought it possible for schools to be Christian without teaching any definite Christian doctrine, or, as it is expressed in the memorandum he presented to the Cabinet, 'We are and mean to remain, a Christian people, and we have made up our minds that the Government shall not in future legislation attempt to teach any special form of Christian faith' (i. 468). This was embodied in the Cowper-Temple clause, which, though introduced by a friend of the

Government and not by a member of it, exactly expressed Mr. Forster's views. He was willing to allow School Boards to make grants to denominational schools; but this proposal was withdrawn to gratify the extreme party, who were represented by the Birmingham League. The friends of voluntary schools were promised a substantial addition to the grant from the Education Department as compensation. This was given, but has been practically nullified by that Department demanding such an increased expenditure as more than swallows up the additional sum paid by the State. The result of the Education Act has been to supply the country with an abundance of schools, and to enforce the attendance of children; but its moral, spiritual, and social results cannot be regarded as satisfactory. If we take into account the tens of thousands of children detained in reformatory and industrial schools, it is difficult to show that crime has materially decreased, while Socialism, Communism, and sedition appear to have increased. To Mr. Forster was also entrusted the Ballot Bill, which was a doubtful gain, if not a positive loss, to the community. After labouring earnestly for his party in Parliament in opposition to the foreign policy of the Government of which Mr. Disraeli was the chief, and in the country for the return of members of the Liberal party at the election of 1880, he was made Secretary for Ireland on that party triumphing and succeeding to office. Possessed with the Radical idea that most of the ills under which that unhappy country was labouring arose from bad legislation, he desired to be a beneficent ruler, who should remove all such evils, and bring happiness and prosperity to the land. The result was grievously disappointing. In spite of his generous and heroic efforts to ameliorate the condition of things, he found them ever growing from bad to Wearied and pained by the result, he was undaunted, and nothing could persuade him to surrender the interests of Great Britain to a conspiracy which he regarded as seditious and ruinous to all good government. When Mr. Gladstone and the rest of the Cabinet took a different view he resigned, after holding his office for two years, and steadfastly upheld the principles for which he contended to the end. He was certainly a high-minded, patriotic, brave, and generous statesman. We think that the bias given to his mind in childhood was unfortunate, and that the legislation which he inaugurated and supported was often the reverse of beneficial to the country, but we cannot withhold our tribute of admiration to the purity and sincerity of his motives, and the ability and the earnestness with which he battled for what he believed to be the right. In the autumn of 1885 he was overtaken by an illness which at first seemed trifling, and which appears to have puzzled the doctors a good deal at first, and after lingering till the following April he died, to the great grief of a large circle of attached friends and the regret of his fellow-countrymen.

1888 Nin

AN

expe inte her vent auth long of a thos for pole of t racti pres whe tion, reso the : aspe stud the esote the i are s seco

of a merg herse poor such key in Prove pictu

ceed

are o

sorie touch the s by t perha expe and book teries lay h

d Mr.

make

drawn

ngham

bstan-

mpen-

y that

e than

of the

ince of

moral,

If we

in re-

me has

edition

ed the

nent in

ch Mr.

embers

cretary

ch that

desired

d bring

sly dis-

eliorate

bad to

ed, and

Great

nous to

of the

ffice for

tended

ve, and

nind in

he in-

to the

to the

earnest-

ht. In

at first

ctors a

he died,

e regret

Pos-

Ninette: an Idyll of Provence. By the author of Vera, Blue Roses, The Maritime Alps and their Seaboard, &c. &c. (London: Hurst and Blackett, 1888.)

A NEW story by the author of Vera would naturally give rise to great expectations among the lovers of good fiction; the more so as an interval of ten years has elapsed since that popular writer produced her last novel. In these days of rapid succession of events and inventions, either of the head or hand, it is no small compliment to the author that Vera should still be so 'freshly remembered;' but so long as Englishmen are Englishmen the story in which the fortunes of a Crimean hero are made with consummate skill to blend with those of a beautiful daughter of Russia, will hold its own, not only for this, but through many a succeeding generation. Wide as the poles asunder is the difference between the story of Vera and that of the writer's latest work, Ninette. In plot, situations, and character it would be difficult to conceive a greater contrast than that presented by the two novels. There is only one exception, the spot where the scene is laid, and which, to judge from the masterly description, the thorough knowledge of the country, with its agricultural resources and the habits of the people, has certainly not in vain been the residence of the writer for the last seventeen years. It is to this aspect of the Riviera that the reader's attention is directed—the study of the native character and humbler method of life pursued by the natural inhabitants of the Maritime Alps rather than to the gay, esoteric existence of the English and foreign society which frequent the fashionable resorts of Cannes and Nice. Dedications of books are seldom even looked at, much less studied; but in them, as in the second title of the book, there very often lies the clue to the succeeding pages—a clue, in the first instance, to the spirit in which they are composed, in the second to the subject they profess to treat.

Ninette is dedicated with much grace and feeling to the memory of a lady whose inherited claim to rank and distinction became merged in the title of 'Duchess of the Poor,' which she won for herself by a life of benevolence and self-denial spent among her poorer brethren. Here, then, is the clue to the true appreciation of such claims upon every thoughtful and generous mind which is the key note of the story; while the second title of the book, An Idyll of Provence, makes any further introduction unnecessary to the perfect picture of French country life which is laid before the reader.

Faithful, simple, and true as a Dutch painting in all the accessories down to the very minutest detail, yet in the pathetic, tender touches, in the passionate love of the beautiful, in the suggestion of the sublime, it possesses qualities which are too often conspicuous by their absence from the canvas of a Dutch artist. It would, perhaps, be more from Meissonnier, in his best mood, that might be expected the series of cabinet pictures which succeed each other, and of which the first may be found in the first paragraph of the book. But the writer is too thoroughly acquainted with the mysteries of her craft to be led away by great descriptive power to overlay her pages with description to the detriment of the narrative.

Ninette is a story of sustained power from beginning to end, it is put together according to the true principles of art; moreover, we congratulate the author upon her hero and heroine. Ninette, in her simple untaught rectitude of conduct, her innate modesty, and child-like faith, recalls some of the happiest touches in the Lucia of the immortal *Promessi Sposi*. Noel Cresp, the soldier lover, as constant as Renzo, is of sterner stuff, and had he lived in the sixteenth instead of the nineteenth century, would have found some equivalent for the 'three respectful summonses' from which it would have been impossible for even a Don Abbondio to escape. His character is admirably drawn and sustained throughout with firmness and delicacy.

It would be difficult to paint a more idyllic scene or one more worthy of a pastoral play than that described at p. 171:—

'Noel was just going to call Ninette when he discovered her close to his feet. There, all her length on the turf, with one hand under her head, and with a basket of wood strawberries at her side, lay the sleeping girl. Noel stood for a moment gazing at her, with one hand shading his eyes and in the other twisting a branch of ivy heavy with its black berries. The little face with its closed lips was pale; the sleeves of her cotton were frayed and faded, yet he felt his heart beat as it had only done when in Tonquin at the commencement of a battle. He was positively afraid to wake her; her, the child whom he remembered as climbing apple-trees, and riding the most undisciplined he-goat in the valley of the Loup while she held on by its horns. How sound her sleep was now! The air just lifted her little curls, and they gave a smiling childlike beauty to her head. . . . How was he to wake her? Should he lift her hand? kiss her sweet half-opened mouth? or touch her eyelids with the branch he held? Suddenly taking a strawberry from her basket he put it inside her lips. Ninette opened her eyes with a little cry and sat upright.'

But for anticipating the pleasure of the book itself the quotation might extend itself to greater length, and other passages might be cited of equally finished workmanship which shine like jewels in the chain of the narrative. There is great originality in the character of the wizard Uncle Anfos Ghiz, and his devout, narrow-minded sister Nerta, who form a strange, but not really ill-assorted, partnership together, in their quaint homestead. The character of the old grandmother, Petronilla, has been sketched with much feeling and tenderness, and presents a beautiful picture of a contented and holy old age in the midst of circumstances of vice, discomfort, and misery, which, but for the love of her granddaughter, would make the sum of all that is emphatically unlovely upon earth.

The earthquake at the Riviera two years since forms a very powerful and legitimate climax for the story; and none but an eyewitness could have conveyed so vivid an impression of the dawn of that awful Ash-Wednesday:—

'Ninette, finding herself alone in the dark, first crossed the room and then threw open the wooden shutter of the window that filled its eastern gable. Day really had begun. A bird twittered. A paleness was creeping up behind the crags, and the dark mass of the town, with its high-piled castle, reared itself grim, ill-defined, and almost portentous against the sky. The valley and the garden, so thick set with orange-trees, were

all sh under water the p

full in

1888

mear powe and l the c that of tin throe a bre heav casei feelin Ther and a crash made hills

> and was acce The char spar of F 'Lit pana of th illus mair slave mad trutl char

when more s put con-

her

hild-

f the

stead

or the

im-

s ad-

cacy.

more

ose to

r her

eping

ading

black

of her

only

posi-

nbing

ley of

was ldlike

nand?

ch he

le her

ation

ht be

n the

ter of

sister

ership

rand-

nder-

y old

isery,

sum

very

eye-

wn of

n and istern

reephighgainst were all shadowy and chill; but the edges of the clouds had begun to flush under the first influences of the dawn, where slumbrous earth and watery sky seemed to melt into one. A distant bell rang, the notes of the peal scattering themselves as it were along the west wind, and breaking softly in the air till, ceasing to vibrate, they were lost.

'The morning light, coming in at the window and striking Ninette full in the face, showed all her pallor and all her grave resolution. She meant to rise from her knees and to go out, but some overmastering power momentarily rooted her to the floor.

'There came along the ground a dull, rumbling noise, rolling nearer and louder, till it was like the passing of a battery of heavy guns when the drivers drive furiously. The air grew full of sounds of groanings that could not be uttered, as if the earth, big with some monstrous birth of time, was heaving and bellowing, and bringing forth in convulsive throes. First the ground rose and then fell as suddenly, and there came a breath as of a fast-sweeping tempest let loose in the four corners of heaven. Then the walls, expanding, made the rafters creak; then the casements falling together as if rattling under a giant's hand, and Ninette, feeling the floor reel under her, made a few hasty steps towards the door. Then, to the rattling noises of chairs and lamps and mirror and bénitier, and of all near objects falling to the ground, there succeeded a terrific crash, and two loud resounding thuds, as of the crags rent in twain, that made the earth and the air vibrate, and then echoed away among the hills' (pp. 297–300).

We have said that the story of *Ninette* is like a beautiful painting, and we know that no picture could claim to be a work of art which was painted all in light without any shadow at all; also that it is an accepted canon of art to set the highest light against the greatest dark. There are purposely very dark shadows in this picture, and the characters of the villain and his accomplice are drawn with an unsparing hand; but the design of the story is to represent the condition of France after the centenary, so soon about to complete itself, of that 'Liberté, Egalité, and Fraternité' which was supposed to be the panacea for all the people's woes; it coincides with the recent reply of the Comte de Paris to the deputation of Parisian workmen; it illustrates the theme of the eloquent Italian preacher who boldly maintained that liberty without religion is in reality the bondage of the slave, and that there is no true liberty but that 'wherewith Christ has made us free.' Let the novelist then bear witness to the same great truth, and the reader will more readily acquiesce in the faithful discharge of the first part of her duty

'To brand the front of vice with pointed scorn,'

when, as in *Ninette*, she is not deterred by any false sentiment, any morbid love of the horrible, from fulfilling the remainder of the injunction—

'And virtue's smiling brow with votive wreaths adorn.'

England in the Fifteenth Century. By the Rev. W. Denton, M.A., Worcester College, Oxford. (London: George Bell and Sons, 1888.)

We are told in the preface of this book that the original intention of its author 'had been to publish two series, each complete in itself.' The first is the present volume, the second would have been a companion sketch of the ecclesiastical state of England. To many person vol. iii. of Stubbs's Constitutional History, or the lighter pages of John Richard Green, contain all that they desire to know of these troublous times. But few who may be persuaded to read Mr. Denton's book will consider it superfluous; rather, we think, they will regret that he has not been spared to finish the task so well begun. The issue of posthumous notes is always difficult, and frequently disappointing; but chapter xi. of Green's Conquest of England may encourage the literary executors of Mr. Denton to edit the materials collected by him. Work such as his ought not to be wasted; the care and thoroughness displayed abundantly in the volume now published lead us ardently to wish for other labourers, like-minded, in the same field.

Hume, Hallam, Carte, were prejudiced against Edward I. But his commanding figure now rises clearly in our English story; and Mr. Denton hardly yields to the Bishop of Chester in admiration of the great king. 'We shall have,' he says (p. 61), 'to reach forward to the sixteenth century, and to the days of the great queen, to find a period comparable in any one line of progress with the times of Edward. In several respects the Elizabethan age probably falls below the level of the age of Edward I.' Had his reign been prolonged to the length of his father's, 'England would have continued to advance in health and peace, and perhaps in godliness' (p. 62).

From 1307 to 1485 the national career was chiefly downward; and 'the evils of the time required a rough but honest far-reaching despotism' (p. 125) to save a kingdom 'which seemed on the point

of dissolution. Edward I. built up the constitution, though Alfred would have been less astonished at it than William I. 'Henry VII. gave to England a dynasty of dictators rather than a line of constitutional sovereigns;' but 'constitutional sovereignty would have been out of place in the disordered times ushered in by the War of the Roses' (p. 125). The light of modern research assures us what those times really were; and from the Rolls Series to articles in contemporary magazines, and even manuscript histories of parishes, no evidence is neglected in these candid pages. The grievous tale of want and privation, pestilence and war, is fully told, gathered from social and domestic annals, as well as from royal chronicles and records: the lust and violence and cruelty which marked the Plantagenets, York and Lancaster alike; the physical weakness and moral degradation of the baronage; the decay of the yeomanry; the misfortune of trader and artisan; the distress of the peasantry; the whole story of national decline. And the indictment is made soberly; its array of well-attested facts can neither be disputed nor put aside.

(pp tha Sco dea who

188

him clar wer Englon eve

cop (pp Sta me: Ap

bes

on

glad

give tion is a asse

mer educimp thro mar and inef (pp.

obe con lost

.A.,

ons,

n of

elf.

om-

ons

s of

nese

Mr.

hey

well

fre-

and

the

be

the

rers,

But

and

n of

vard

find

s of

falls

pro-

ued

ard:

hing oint

nave

e to

onal

it of

ses'

mes

rary

ce is

and

and

the ork

tion

e of

y of y of Incidentally many statements strike us, some conspicuous for contravention of current opinion: notably the results of Bannockburn (pp. 31–66). Few Scotchmen will relish Mr. Denton's conclusion, that 'five hundred years of suffering, during which great part of Scotland relapsed into barbarism, were the consequence of Edward's death and the worthlessness of his successor'...'At the moment when, unhappily for both countries, an English nobleman, availing himself of provincial prejudices, raised with the help of the highland clans the standard of rebellion against Edward, the people of Scotland were advancing materially and intellectually on a par with those of England,'... and the defeat at Bannockburn 'was the source of long misfortune to England, and of the most terrible calamities that ever befel Scotland.'

Another bold departure from usual criticism is the explanation on page 19 of Edward's famous statute *De Religiosis*. And we are also glad to see stated plainly of the Feudal System that 'in its completeness it never gained a footing in England' (p. 27).

Unusual interest will be attracted at present to the insurrection of copyhold tenants and agricultural labourers in the reign of Richard II. (pp. 105 sqq.). The Ordinance of 1349, commonly called the Statute of Labourers, though it was issued prior to consent of Parliament, is well treated on pages 219, 239; and more fully in the Appendix, Note B, p. 311. Mr. Denton's statements should be read beside those of Mr. Green 1 and Bishop Stubbs. 2

An early view of the allotment question (circa 1500) may be found on p. 246, and the original letter of the worthy vicar of Quinton is given on p. 318, Appendix D.

Another picture of new life in the old will be seen in the description of local courts; a return to which, in the form of county councils, is a feature of modern times. The dissolution of these ancient assemblies was attended with many and great disadvantages:—

'It diminished the share once possessed by the people in the government of the country, deprived them of one valuable element of political education, and turned their attention more to party objects than to social improvement. More than this, the extinction of these local tribunals has thrown upon parliament a mass of business it is oftentimes unable to manage; or attempts to manage without possessing any local knowledge, and therefore naturally mismanages; and it is every year adding to the inefficiency of the one court which has swallowed up almost every other' (pp. 16, 17).

Further noteworthy passages tempt the reader to linger, but we have space for only one reflection more—a regret that the clergy did not obey the Writ of Summons for the Assembly of 1295. For by their continual neglect through the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries they lost the privilege of sitting in Parliament at all.

¹ History of the English People, vol. i. book iv. p. 431.

² Constitutional History of England, vol. iii. p. 603.

Ulysses, or Scenes and Studies in Many Lands. By W. GIFFORD PALGRAVE, H.M. Minister Resident in Uruguay. (London: Macmillan and Co., 1888.)

MR. PALGRAVE is a great traveller, and it is not without reason that he ventures to bestow on himself the title of Ulysses. But it is not merely the seeing of cities and the manners of many men that constitutes a Ulysses. There is a certain way of seeing them and a certain kind of character, such as Homer describes, Sophocles hints at, and Tennyson has modernized, which makes up the conception of Ulysses, which to our mind Mr. Palgrave hardly embodies. The freshness, simplicity, and intense poetical charm of the Odyssey are hardly represented in what we may venture to call the Palgraviad. The element of personal adventure is certainly subordinated to that of useful information. There is one circumstance about the work which is rather puzzling to a reviewer. We are not sure how far the present collection of miscellaneous papers has or has not been already published. Some of them certainly have been so published, for we are referred to the Cornhill, the Fortnightly, and Macmillan. Others contain no such reference, but it is none the less certain that they are republications. Of some few it is impossible to speak with cer-

It is to be regretted that this point is not made clear. There is a lack of personal interest in the volume. It would have been better to have thrown it more into the form of an autobiography, and to have supplied some missing links and references. As it is we may have a Ulysses, but we certainly have not got an Odyssey. The book has neither contents nor an index, which Bayle said was the soul of a book. The longest article is an Arabian story, which the author appears to have thought too good to be lost, but which is out of harmony with the general design of the volume. Taken for what it is, a collection of travel papers in regions so far apart as Georgia and the West Indian Isles, we have the summarized results of various experiences by an observant and highly cultivated traveller, utilising some special advantages. They often give full information on subjects where we desiderate such. Thus the paper entitled 'Phra-bat' is some account of Siamese Buddhism, drawn from a three years' residence in Siam, or Thaï, which Mr. Palgrave thinks the more correct name. The word 'Phra-bat' signifies literally 'the foot-print of the Lord,' and is applied to a range of hills, the scene of many pilgrimages, in one locality of which the supposed foot-print is to be found. The foot-print symbol is a favourite one in Buddhist countries, and Mr. Gifford says, 'Christianity and Mohammedanism [bracketed together] alike claim veneration for the foot-marks of their respective founders at Jerusalem, Damascus, and Rome.' No one supposes that Christianity was ever bound up with any legendary foot-print of the Redeemer. To this shrine, where there is a gigantic statue of Buddha in the midst of a crowd of little Buddhas, the Siamese devotees continually resort. The supposed foot-print is nearly five feet by three, and bears no resemblance whatever to a human foot. It is, however, considered identified by a hundred and eight distinctive marks. Mr. Palgrave is very much

imp Gre the sand the bind long (p.

188

(p. a ' (peta right her Phrito i idol nar:

ing.

aut

hop Am yet higl gray grou nev perl the of S of a ship life and a lig tea betv desc that crea Ada

it or not, origi with (p. 2

are:

ct.

RD

n:

nat

ot

on-

er-

at,

of

he

are

ad.

ork

the

idy

we

ers

ney

er-

uld

to-

ces.

an.

yle

ory,

but

me.

far

zed

ted

in-

per

awn

ave

ite-

ills,

sed

one

-olv

the

and

vith

nere

l of

up-

nce

by

uch

impressed with the Buddhist worship. 'The bloody sacrifices of Greece and Rome, the monster-peopled twilights of Hindoo worship, the melancholy symbols of pain and death so frequent in Catholic sanctuaries, the dull weary decorum of a Protestant church—none of these have place in "Phra-bat," where, on the contrary, all combines to announce that religion is something joyful, something belonging to the bright side of life, and to be approached accordingly' (p. 187). Does Mr. Palgrave consider that this is a fair account of a 'Catholic sanctuary' or 'Protestant church'? He exclaims Esto perpetua to the Buddhism of Siam. 'The best wish of her friends may rightly be that she may long continue faithful as ever to the memory of her first law-giver, and to the system symbolized at Phra-bat and Phrai-Chai.' He is strongly against missionaries, and advises us not to interfere with the worship of idols, as he considers that we are all idolaters ourselves (see p. 164).

We go, with our author, from the far East to the far West. His narrative of a journey 'From Monte Video to Paraguay' is interest-But here, as elsewhere, we have to doubt the accuracy of our author's judgment. 'I will venture,' he writes, 'on a not ungrounded hope that the venturesome Confederations and Republics of the American South may have before them a nobler destiny than has yet been apportioned to their counterpart, on the northern continent, higher aims and wider fulfilment.' We can see nothing in Mr. Palgrave's narrative, or in any similar narratives, that gives any sure grounds for such a hope. He incidentally mentions that he has never been to the United States, or, we suppose, to Canada, which is perhaps an explanation of the paragraph. The climatic differences, the racial differences are such, that there can never be any question of South America surpassing North America. The chapter consists of a historical account of the country, during and since the dictatorship of Lopez, necessarily meagre, and some particulars of its social life and natural productions. Among these last is the yerva, 'the dry and pulverised leaf often spoken of as Paraguayan tea,' and 'maté, a light tonic drink, not unlike Japanese tea. He thinks that the real tea of China might be introduced and supplant both. The contrast between the anticipations of his prefatory note and the unfavourable description of places and people is at least remarkable. He thinks that the native race is probably Mongolian, or perhaps had a separate creation to themselves. Anyhow they do not belong to the race Adamique.

'Nor does it appear why the same cause or cases [causes?], whatever it or they may be, which originated the Mongolian race in Asia, should not, simultaneously or at a different period of our planet's existence, have originated another race of mankind in America, identical or nearly so with the first, yet wholly independent of it in genealogical descent' (p. 284).

We can only give a catalogue raisonné of the other papers. They are: (1) 'Byzantine Anatolia,' too wide a title for a limited survey; (2) 'The Monastery of Sumdar,' which is interesting and reminds us of Curzon's books; (3) 'Anatolian Spectre Stories,' hardly within the

range of a volume of travels; (4) 'Turkish Georgia;' (5) 'Upper Egypt and Thebes,' very much after date; (6) 'West Indian Memories;' (7) 'The Three Cities,' which is, however, only a description of one of them, Hong-Kong; (8) 'Kioto,' a chapter on the early nature-worship of Japan before Buddha. One other paper has to be enumerated, 'Malay Life in the Philippines,' which is fresh and bright, and more interesting than most of the others. The following extract will be à propos to the recent discussion respecting Mr. Isaac Taylor's views on Mohammedanism:

'Not less does experience show that, sooner or later, the tribe, the nation, that casts in its lot with Islam, is stricken as by a blight; its freshness, its plasticity disappear first, then its vigour, then its reparative and reproductive power, and it petrifies or perishes. With the abstract and theoretical merits of Monotheism or Polytheism, Islam or Christianity, I have nothing to do; but this much is certain, that within the circle of the Philippine archipelago itself—not to seek examples further away—the contrast between the Mahometan villages on the southernmost islands, and the Christian ones elsewhere, is very remarkable, nor by any means favourable to the former' (pp. 153-4).

Breviarium Romanum a Francisco Cardinali Quignonio editum et recognitum juxta Editionem Venetiis A.D. 1535 impressam. Curante JOHANNE WICKHAM LEGG, Societatis Antiquariorum atque Collegii Regalis Medicorum Londinensium Socio, in Nosocomio Sancti Bartholomæi olim Prælectore. Cantabrigiæ: Typis atque impensis Academiæ. MDCCLXXXVIII.

Pressure of other matter has again crowded out the fuller account of Dr. Wickham Legg's admirable edition of the First Text of the Quignon Breviary, which we promised to give our readers, when in a few hurried lines at the close of our number for April 1888 we announced the important fact of its publication. This promise we hope to redeem next January, but meanwhile we are anxious to impress upon all who are interested in liturgical studies how great is the service which Dr. Legg and the Cambridge University Press, between them, have rendered by giving us in a handy volumematching in size and general 'get up' the Cambridge edition of the Sarum Breviary—the ready means of comparing the Cardinal's Reformed Breviary with our own Book of Common Prayer. In one respect we should have been truly glad if the book had been somewhat less handy. For the reduction in bulk is due to the fact that neither the Lessons nor the Psalms are printed in full, only the opening and closing words of each being given. This we cannot but consider a very serious drawback. It obviously involves the necessity of incessant reference to a copy of the Vulgate. It also entails a somewhat infelicitous contrast; for the 'Third Lessons' from non-Biblical sources enjoy the privilege of being printed in full, which is denied to the more sacred Lessons from the Bible itself. Dr. Legg regrets he has not been able 'to strike the source' of all these 'Third Lessons.' He ought rather to congratulate himself on his success, for, as we make out, there are only seventeen which he has failed to identify, in consequence of enforced absence from a large library,

sec

188

stor an of nat

Ma hav Res hav and us, the

The

sev whithus assistance admits a post admits of the control of the

he of t the By dig in t tior to hea

des

per

no-

ion

ırlv

be

ght,

act

or's

the

tive

ract

ris-

the

her

by

:08-

nte

nio

que

unt

the

in

we

we

to

eat

ess,

the

Re-

ne

ne-

hat

ing

der

es-

hat

cal

ied

ets

ird

ess,

to

ry,

and these we have no doubt he will be able to supply in time for a second edition, when we trust the University Press will reconsider their determination to give nothing but the headings of the Psalter and other Biblical portions. The labour which Dr. Legg has bestowed on the editing of this First Text—to be followed as we trust by an edition of the Second Text—is beyond all praise. In this branch of liturgical literature the University Press has certainly been fortunate in its editors. We hope the syndicate may meet with every encouragement to continue labours so auspiciously begun.

our remarks on the use and general history of this Bre

Our remarks on the use and general history of this Breviary and on its influence on other breviaries and liturgies—especially our own Matins and Evensong—we reserve for the next number. Attempts have been made, in certain quarters, to represent Cardinal Quignon's Reformed Breviary as only intended for private use. We should have thought this hard to reconcile both with the facts of the case, and also with the language of Pope Paul III. in the volume before us, p. xxvi. But what are facts to those who need to bolster up a theory?

The Armour of Light, and other Sermons, preached before the Queen. By the Rev. George Prothero, M.A., of Brasenose College, Oxford, Chaplain in Ordinary to Her Majesty the Queen, Canon of Westminster, and Rector of Whippingham. Revised and prepared for publication by ROWLAND E. PROTHERO, Fellow of All Souls' College, Oxford. (London: Rivingtons, 1888.)

In a very charming, and even touching, Preface, written on his seventy-first birthday, Canon Prothero submits to us four motives which have induced him to publish this volume of Sermons, and thus 'for the first time set his name to a printed book.' We beg to assure him that it was quite unnecessary to put forward a word of apology or of justification for what he has done. He modestly admits that of the motives thus alleged none are 'adequate.' 'I have essayed,' he adds, 'no original explanation of doctrinal difficulties; I have preached no new gospel; I have offered no fresh interpretation of insoluble problems' (is this conscious or unconscious sarcasm?); 'I have attempted no novel reconciliation of the conflicting claims of religion and modern thought.' May not this be the very source of the charm which these Sermons seem to us to possess? It is this unobtrusiveness of treatment, this willingness-nay, this desire-to be absorbed, to be effaced, by the overpowering vastness of the themes he handles, which is at the root of the power which the simple words of these Sermons undoubtedly exercise. They are pre-eminently-will the criticism be thought grotesque?-the sermons of a gentleman. By which we mean, there is in the style a characteristic amount of dignified reserve and retiringness, a shrinking from all exaggeration in thought or expression, and above all a total absence of self-assertion and self-consciousness. The preacher's one desire seems to be to rouse the mental activity and quicken the spiritual life of his We do not find a trace in these pages of the spirit so ably described and so justly denounced in the following passage extracted

from the very beautitiful sermon on the 'Simplicity of Christ's Teaching' (p. 268):—

'It is a very common habit among religious men or women to pick and choose their own line in religion, and to follow their own particular religious crotchet. God's way is too old-fashioned for them; it is not abreast of the times; it is not spiritual enough. It might have suited the infancy of Christian faith. But in the nineteenth century a larger field of action is required; more room is needed for the expansion and the development of spiritual cravings than was necessary or desirable in the first ages of a primitive Christianity. It is beyond denial that such persons are dissatisfied unless they are men of mark. But there is a very different view of the true sign of spirituality. "We are never so high in spiritual life as when we seem just like everybody else."

This kind of flavour and treatment in sermons may be by some considered jejune and old-fashioned, but when we find a Church Congress on the point of meeting to consider, *inter alia*, the 'adaptation of the creeds (!!!) to modern needs,' we think it is high time to rally round the standard of those who are old-fashioned enough to cling to 'the faith once delivered unto the saints.'

We cannot refrain from quoting one more passage from this charming volume, in the editing of which the author owns himself 'indebted on every page, if not in every line,' to his son, Mr. Rowland E. Prothero. Our quotation is from the Preface:—

'Sermons form the hortus siccus of a parson's life. Here are the pale flowers of my spring; here are the ruddier blooms into which my summer heat has entered; here the faded marigolds of ripe October; here the pinched blossoms that have defied the chilling frosts of winter. They are ready, as it were, to crumble; yet for me they retain a fragrance and colour; for me they possess the charm of association and of memory. Strangers will find in them no such fascination; they will probably think them sapless, hueless, scentless.'

With the concluding words of this passage our readers will have gathered that we entirely and emphatically disagree.

BRIEF NOTES ON NEW BOOKS, NEW EDITIONS, PERIODICALS, &C.

In our last number, p. 492, we called attention to the two first volumes of a reissue of the works of Bishop Kaye, and pointed out the substantial value of his contributions to patristic literature and ecclesiastical history. Five more volumes have appeared since then, viz.: Works of John Kay, Bishop of Lincoln; vol. iii. The Writings and Opinions of Justin Martyr; vol. iv. The Ecclesiastical History of Eusebius; vol. v. The Council of Nicae in Connexion with the Life of Athanasius; vol. vi. Sermons and Addresses; vol. vii. Charges, Speeches, and Letters (London: Rivingtons, 1888). To none of these volumes is there any index, which materially interferes with their usefulness. The last volume, which contains Charges, &c., from 1821 onwards, is extremely interesting as exhibiting the first germ of controversies and of legislation which have now been finally disposed of—not always for good. The addresses to Eton boys before and

afte

1888

Libi and valu Kin Mu repr Ath Gill weld seco Pre the

sha

full

thro

short atta ther ther sity, was boo shill lishe it the ther in the

and incl We face han Chr

the Fait Like a te of c an u and ardu

of F

st's

pick

ular

not

ited

ield

de-

first ons dif-

h in

ome

irch

pta-

e to

1 to

this

self

OW-

pale

mer the are and

ory.

nink

ave

&c.

first

out

and

hen,

ings

Life

rges,

hese

heir

rom

n of

osed

and

after Confirmation, in vol. vi., leave much to be desired in tone and teaching.

Five new volumes have appeared in *The Ancient and Modern Library of Theological Literature* (London: Griffith, Farran, Okeden, and Welsh, 1888) since we last had occasion to recommend this valuable series. They are as follows: 1. *The First Prayer-Book of King Edward VI.*, 1549, reprinted from a copy in the British Museum. 2. *The Second Prayer-Book of King Edward VI.*, 1552, reprinted, &c. 3. *The Whole Duty of Man.* 4. *The Orations of St. Alhanasius against the Arians.* 5. *Christ's Victory and Triumph, by Giles Fletcher; and other Poems of the Seventeenth Century.* All will welcome the two first of these volumes, the reprints of the first and second Prayer-Books of Edward VI. The Editor tells us in the Preface to No. 1, that it is intended in subsequent volumes to show the successive changes which have brought our Liturgy to its present shape. From the Preface we extract a passage which may usefully stimulate inquiry among those who are curious in hunting through bookstalls, &c.:—

'Whilst the Committee on the Liturgy were pursuing their labours, a short office in English was prepared, which is now so rare as to be hardly attainable. But individual congregations here and there procured for themselves translations of the whole Mass into English, and a few of them are in existence. The late eminent librarian of Cambridge University, Mr. Bradshaw, mentioned some of these to Dr. Edwin Freshfield, and was at a loss to account for them. The latter referred him to the account books of St. Michael's, Cornhill, where, in 1547, there is an item of "ten shillings paid to the master of Paule's School for writing the Mass in Englishe." They would not wait for the authorized Liturgy, but anticipated it thus, and had the Mass, according to the Sarum use, in English for themselves, whilst they also sold the vestments and destroyed the images in their church, and had the walls "painted with Scriptures" (p. viii.)

The fact thus elucidated by Dr. Freshfield is a very curious one, and, we may add, not generally known. We trust the Editors may include in their series a specimen of one of these 'Masses in English.' We presume these translations are not all *verbatim* alike. The Preface to the Athanasius volume, No. 4, is short, but shows a master hand.

The Hallowing of Work, by Francis Paget, D.D., Canon of Christ Church (London: Rivingtons, 1888), is, we need scarcely say, a very charming volume, composed of addresses given in the Chapel of Eton College, at a meeting of Public Schoolmasters, January 16-18, 1888. The subject of these addresses may be briefly described as the Life of Self-Consecration, and the place in that life and work of Faith, Hope, and Charity, 'those first principles of self-consecration.' Like everything else which Dr. Paget writes, this booklet is full of a tender grace, a keenness of insight, a width of sympathy, a depth of culture, and a gentleness of spirit which will always secure to him an unique position in the preacher's pulpit or the professor's chair, and which we trust may follow him ere long to a yet higher and more arduous sphere of thought and influence and action. The public

THE

a ser

of K

And

finde

found

'cert

are e

them

ately

he sa

with

could

gener

who i

noble

able We a

perm

of it

which is the

One i

well a

biogra

In

VO

T

schoolmasters who had the privilege of listening to these addresses must indeed have been dense, and dull of hearing, if they did not catch some at least of the spirit which breathes in every line of these heart-stirring words.

The English Historical Review, No. 11, July 1888 (London: Longmans), has a very attractive paper on 'Hrotsvitha of Gandersheim,' the well-known nun of the tenth century, and her six dramas and Latin verses, by Mr. W. H. Hudson. The author very properly dismisses the charge of their being forgeries by the first Editor, Celtes and his friends, in 1501. He inclines to the opinion that they were not intended to be acted—in which we do not agree; but we are only speaking from the impression made on our mind some twenty years ago when we first studied the subject. This number also contains two excellent articles on 'The Early Life of Thomas Wolsey' and on 'The Great Condé,' by T. W. Cameron and J. B. Perkins respectively. Not the least interesting portion, however, of this, as of other numbers, of this Review, consists of the appended 'Notes and Documents' and 'Reviews of Books.'

That the Archwological Review (London: Nutt) has reached the first number of the second volume testifies rather to the enterprise of the publisher than to the excellence of the publications. It has from its early infancy shown marked feebleness of constitution, and if we might offer a suggestion it would be a change of Nurse. Verbum sab.

A Chapter in English Church History: being the Minutes of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge for the years 1698-1704. Edited by the Rev. Edmund McClure, M.A., Editorial Secretary of the S.P.C.K. (London: S.P.C.K., 1888). This publication does great credit to the able and accomplished Secretary of the S.P.C.K., who must have had infinite trouble in ferreting out the information contained in the notes to this very curious Chapter—as it is well called—in English History. We cordially commend it to the notice of our readers. It was new to us that one of the main branches of the Society's design, when first started, was to 'reduce the Quakers to the Christian Faith' (p. 22).

The same Society sends us two most admirable handbooks, as we may be allowed to call them: Anglo-Saxon Literature, by John Earle (London: S.P.C.K., 1888); and Domesday Book: A Popular Account of the Exchequer Manuscript so called, with Notices of the Principal Points of General Interest which it contains, by Walter de Gray Birch, F.S.A. (London: S.P.C.K., 1887). Any book to which the Rawlinson professor puts his name becomes, so to speak, a classic from its birth. Mr. Birch's book, if very far from being the best possible, is certainly very near being the best extant work on the Domesday Book. We have no doubt it will be greatly improved in a second edition.

Every parish priest who has not parted with the belief that house-to-house visitation is one of the most solemn and most important of his duties, will be glad to know of and to possess *The Parish Priest's Register* (London: S.P.C.K.), arranged in due sort for making notes on each family so visited.